arXiv:1408.7105v2 [math.CO] 29 Nov 2015

PROOF OF STASINSKI AND VOLL'S HYPEROCTAHEDRAL GROUP CONJECTURE

AARON LANDESMAN

Abstract. In a recent paper, Stasinski and Voll introduced a length-like statistic on hyperoctahedral groups and conjectured a product formula for this statistic's signed distribution over arbitrary descent classes. Stasinski and Voll proved this conjecture for a few special types of descent classes. We prove this conjecture in full, showing it holds for all descent classes. In the case that the descent class is a singleton, this formula gives the Poincaré polynomials for the varieties of symmetric matrices of a fixed rank.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we prove the conjecture of Stasinski and Voll [4, Conjecture 1] as written in Theorem 2.5 below. This result has relations to the Poincaré polynomials of the $n \times n$ symmetric matrices over $\mathbb{F}_q$ of a given rank, as noted in [4, p. 3]. The result also gives a formula for representation zeta functions associated to a particular group scheme, as described in [4, p. 3-4],[5, Definition 1.2, Theorem C]. Additionally, this result immediately implies the validity of the interesting identity given in [5, Proposition 5.5]. Finally, an analog of Theorem 2.5, which sums monomials over $S_n^{I^c}$ instead of $B_n^{I^c}$, can be found in [3, Conjecture C].

The main result states that a certain generating function for a length-like statistic on descent classes of the hyperoctahedral group, B_n, always has a simple formula. The main idea of the proof is to find an appropriate recursion for the product form of the generating function, and then to check combinatorially that the generating function as a summation satisfies this same recursion. The results described in the background section are mostly due to previous work, and the results in the following sections are original.

The outline of the paper is as follows. First, in Section 2, we present background material, including the relevant previous partial progress toward the main result, Theorem 2.5. Then, in Section 3, we give a recursion that the product form of the generating function satisfies. Next, in Section 4 we state Theorem 4.3, and we show why this theorem implies Theorem 2.5. In Section 5 we describe some crucial involutions which will allow us to restrict the set of elements over which the generating function is summed. In Sections 6, 7, and 8 we show why the first, second, and third parts of Theorem 4.3 hold. By far the most difficult is part 3, which will involve characterizing certain elements in B_n, which we call "initially uncanceled" and "finally uncanceled," and then describing a bijection between these two types of elements. Finally, in Section 9, we state a further conjecture, which involves a generalization of the generating function to two variables.

When this paper was in the final stages of preparation for submission, we learned that [3, Conjecture C] and [4, Conjecture 1] have recently been proven by F. Brenti and A. Carnevale [2, Theorems 4.2 and 5.4], who obtain a different proof of the main result of this paper. Brenti and Carnevale's proof uses induction together with the additional technique of "shifting and compressing," as described in [2, Section 3].

2. Background

2.1. **Notation for B_n.** Throughout this paper, we will only use congruence conditions of the form $a \equiv b \bmod 2$, and so we drop the "mod2," and henceforth write $a \equiv b$ to simplify

notation. We let

$$\begin{aligned}[n] &= \{1, \dots, n\} \\ [n]_0 &= \{0, \dots, n\} \\ [\pm n]_0 &= \{-n, \dots, n\} \\ \mathbb{N} &= \{n \in \mathbb{Z}, n > 0\} \\ \mathbb{N}_0 &= \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.\end{aligned}$$

We have an action of S_{2n+1} on $[\pm n]_0$ given by the standard permutation action on the $2n+1$ elements of $[\pm n]_0$. The *hyperoctahedral group* is by definition $B_n = \{w \in S_{2n+1} \mid w(-n) = -w(n)\}$. A convenient way to notate $w \in B_n$ will be $w = [i_1, \dots, i_n]$ which means that for $t \in [n]$, we have $w(t) = i_t, w(0) = 0$, and $w(-t) = -i_t$.

Definition 2.1. Let $w \in B_n$. Define the *signed permutation matrix* which we notate as $w \in M_{n \times n}$. It is defined by

$$w_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } w(j) = i, \\ -1 & \text{if } w(j) = -i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We often go back and forth between thinking about $w \in B_n$ and $w \in M_{n \times n}$. When encountering the notation $w(k)$, think of $w \in B_n$.

Lemma 2.2. [1, p. 243, Proposition 8.1.3] *The group B_n is the Coxeter group generated by the involutions $s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}$, where $s_0 = [-1, 2, 3, \dots, n]$, and $s_i = [1, 2, \dots, i-1, i+1, i, \dots, n]$ for $i > 0$, and satisfying the Coxeter relations $s_i^2 = e, (s_0 s_1)^4 = e, (s_i s_{i+1})^3 = e$ for $i \in [n-2]$ and $(s_i s_j)^2 = e$ if $j \neq i \pm 1$.*

Let $w \in B_n$. Let $l : B_n \to \mathbb{N}_0$ denote the usual Coxeter length function. Define the sign function, $\operatorname{sgn} : B_n \to \{\pm 1\}$, where $\operatorname{sgn}(w) = (-1)^{l(w)}$. A useful equivalent characterization is that $\operatorname{sgn}(w) = \det(w)$, the determinant of the signed permutation matrix associated to w. Throughout this paper, we will only have to deal with the easy to calculate $\operatorname{sgn}(w)$, instead of the slightly more difficult to calculate $l(w)$. Denote the *descent set* $D(w) = \{i \in [n-1]_0 \mid l(ws_i) < l(w)\}$, which is the usual Coxeter right descent set. Also, say w *has a descent at* k if $k \in D(w)$. The descent set has an alternate characterization, which we now state in Lemma 2.3. We shall almost exclusively use the following characterization throughout the paper.

Lemma 2.3. [1, p. 248, Proposition 8.1.2] *For all $w \in B_n$, there is an equality $D(w) = \{i \in [n-1]_0 \mid w(i) > w(i+1)\}$.*

We now recall some notation introduced in [4, p. 2]. Fix n. Let $I \subset [n-1]_0$. Notate the *quotient* $B_n^I = \{w \in B_n \mid D(w) \subset I^c\}$, where by definition $I^c = [n-1]_0 \setminus I$. Let J be a set. The notation $J = \{i_1, \dots, i_l\}_<$ means $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_l$. Define the L statistic by $L : B_n \to \mathbb{N}_0$, with

$$L(w) = \frac{1}{2} \left| \{(i,j) \in [\pm n]_0 \times [\pm n]_0 \mid i < j, w(i) > w(j), i \not\equiv j\} \right|.$$

Let k be a column index. Denote by $i_w(k)$ the unique row index such that $w_{i_w(k),k} \neq 0$. That is, row $i_w(k)$ is the row in which the ± 1 in column k lies. Similarly, if k is a row index, let $j_w(k)$ be the unique column index such that $w_{k,j_w(k)} \neq 0$. When reference to some $w \in B_n$ is clear we often abuse notation by writing $i(k) = i_w(k), j(k) = j_w(k)$.

Definition 2.4. For $w \in B_n$, an entry $w_{i,j}$ is (*row*) *above* of $w_{k,l}$ if $i < k$, i.e., if $w_{i,j}$ lies in a row that is above the row $w_{k,l}$ lies in. Also, $w_{i,j}$ is (*row*) *below* $w_{k,l}$ if $i > k$. Similarly, $w_{i,j}$ is (*column*) *right* of $w_{k,l}$ if $j > l$ and (*column*) *left* if $j < l$. Finally, $w_{s,t}$ is *row between* $w_{i,j}$ and $w_{k,l}$ if $\max(i,k) \geq s \geq \min(i,k)$ and $w_{s,t}$ is *column between* $w_{i,j}$ and $w_{k,l}$ if $\max(j,l) \geq t \geq \min(j,l)$. When it is clear, we drop the parenthesized "column" and "row."

By abuse of notation, if j, l are columns indices, say j is column left (respectively column right) l if $w_{i(j),j}$ is column left (respectively column right) $w_{i(l),l}$, and for s another column index, say s is column between row j and row l when $w_{i(s),s}$ is column between $w_{i(j),j}$ and $w_{i(l),l}$.

Similarly, when i, k are row indices, then row i is row above (respectively row below) row k if $w_{i,j(i)}$ is row above (respectively row below) $w_{k,j(k)}$, and for t another column index, say t is row between i and k when $w_{t,j(t)}$ is row between $w_{i,j(i)}$ and $w_{k,j(k)}$.

2.2. **Notation for $f_{n,I}(X)$.** Let us briefly recall the notation for $f_{n,I}(X)$ introduced in [4, p. 2]. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Define

$$(\underline{n}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = 0 \\ 1 - X^n & \text{if } n > 0, \end{cases}$$
$$(\underline{n})! = (\underline{n}) \cdot (\underline{n-1}) \cdots (\underline{2}) \cdot (\underline{1})$$
$$(\underline{n})!! = \prod_{i \in [n], i \equiv 0} (\underline{i}).$$

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_l\}_< \subset [n-1]_0$, let $i_0 = 0$, and let $i_{l+1} = n$. Further, for $0 \leq t \leq l$, define

$$\delta_t = i_{t+1} - i_t$$

and

$$f_{n,I}(X) = \frac{(\underline{n})!}{(\underline{i_1})! \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{l} (\underline{\delta_k})!!}. \tag{2.1}$$

2.3. **The Main Result.**

Theorem 2.5. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}, I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_l\}_< \subset [n-1]_0$. Then*

$$\sum_{w \in B_n^{I^c}} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)} = f_{n,I}(X).$$

Theorem 2.5 was proved in the following special cases: $I = \{0\}, I = [n-1]_0$, and all elements of $I \cup \{n\}$ are even [4, Theorem 2]. The remainder of the paper presents a proof that holds for any $I \subset [n-1]_0$. The proof proceeds by induction on n. We first demonstrate a recursive relation for the polynomials $f_{n,I}(X)$, and then show that this same recursion applies to the expression $\sum_{w \in B_n^{I^c}} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)}$.

2.4. **Relevant Results from Stasinski and Voll.** In order to proceed with the proof, we recount the relevant progress toward Theorem 2.5 made in [4]. First, we recall that to prove Theorem 2.5, we can restrict to summing over chessboard elements, as defined in Definition 2.6.

Definition 2.6. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$C_n = \{w \in B_n \mid w_{i,j} \neq 0 \implies i + j \equiv 0\}.$$

If $w \in C_n$, say w is a *chessboard element*. For $n \in \mathbb{N}, I \subset [n-1]_0$, define $C_n^I = C_n \cap B_n^I$.

In [4], Stasinski and Voll call C_n, defined in Definition 2.6, $C_{n,0}$, in order to differentiate it from another set $C_{n,1} \subset B_n$.

Lemma 2.7 (Chessboard Lemma [4, p. 9, Lemma 8])**.** *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}, I \subset [n-1]_0$. Then,*

$$\sum_{w \in B_n^{I^c}} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)} = \sum_{w \in C_n^{I^c}} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)}.$$

Definition 2.8. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}, I \subset [n-1]_0$. Define

$$S_{n,I}(X) = \sum_{w \in C_n^{I^c}} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)}.$$

Corollary 2.9. *To show Theorem 2.5, it suffices to show $S_{n,I}(X) = f_{n,I}(X)$.*

Proof. If $S_{n,I}(X) = f_{n,I}(X)$, by the Chessboard Lemma 2.7,

$$\sum_{w \in B_n^{I^c}} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)} = \sum_{w \in C_n^{I^c}} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)} = S_{n,I}(X) = f_{n,I}(X).$$

□

We next recall statistics introduced in [4], which will help us calculate L, by Lemma 2.12.

Definition 2.10. For $n \in \mathbb{N}, w \in B_n$, and j, j' so that $1 \leq j, j' \leq n$, define the statistics

$$a(w) = |\{j \in [n] \mid w_{i(j),j} = -1, j \not\equiv 0\}|$$

$$b_{j,j'}(w) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } j < j', i(j) > i(j'), j \not\equiv j' \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$c_{j,j'}(w) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } j < j', w_{i(j'),j'} = -1, i(j) < i(j'), j \not\equiv j' \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$b_{j'}(w) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{j,j'}(w),$$

$$c_{j'}(w) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{j,j'}(w),$$

$$b(w) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j(w),$$

$$c(w) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j(w).$$

Remark 2.11. It is immediate from the definitions that the statistics a, b, and c defined in Definition 2.10 agree with those in [4, Definition 4]. Namely,

$$a(w) = |\{j \in [n] \mid w_{i(j),j} = -1, j \not\equiv 0\}|$$
$$b(w) = |\{(j, j') \in [n] \times [n] \mid j < j', i(j) > i(j'), j \not\equiv j'\}|$$
$$c(w) = |\{(j, j') \in [n] \times [n] \mid w_{i(j'),j'} = -1, j < j', i(j) < i(j'), j \not\equiv j'\}|.$$

Lemma 2.12 (abc Lemma [4, p. 7, Lemma 6, Equation (11)])**.** *Let $w \in B_n$. Then, $L(w) = a(w) + b(w) + 2 \cdot c(w)$.*

3. The $f_{n,I}(X)$ recursion

Now that we have established preliminary notation and previous results, in this section we will show the $f_{n,I}(X)$ satisfy a certain recursion. Following this section, we will show the polynomials $S_{n,I}(X)$ satisfy the same recursion and agree when $n = 1$, proving $S_{n,I}(X) = f_{n,I}(X)$. This then proves Theorem 2.5 by Corollary 2.9.

Definition 3.1. Recall $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_l\}_< \subset [n-1]_0$. For $k \in [l+1]$, set

$$I^{(k)} = \{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_k - 1, \dots, i_l - 1\} \cap [n-2]_0,$$

viewed as a subset of $[n-2]_0$.

Proposition 3.2. *Recall $\delta_t = i_{t+1} - i_t$ and let m be the biggest index such that δ_m is odd, if such an m exists. Otherwise, let $m = -1$. Then, the $f_{n,I}(X)$ satisfy the recurrence*

$$f_{n,I}(X) = \begin{cases} -X^n \cdot f_{n-1,I^{(m+1)}}(X) + \sum_{t=m+1}^{l+1} X^{n-i_t} \cdot f_{n-1,I^{(t)}}(X) & \text{if } m \neq -1, \\ \sum_{t=1}^{l+1} X^{n-i_t} \cdot f_{n-1,I^{(t)}}(X) & \text{if } m = -1. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. We shall only prove Equation (3.1) in the case that $m \neq -1$, as the proof of the case when $m = -1$ is analogous. Observe that by definition,

$$(\underline{k-1})!! = \begin{cases} \frac{(\underline{k})!!}{(\underline{k})} & \text{if } k \equiv 0, \\ (\underline{k})!! & \text{if } k \not\equiv 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

For $t \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq t \leq l+1$,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{n-1,I^{(t)}}(X) &= \frac{(\underline{n-1})!}{(\underline{i_1})! \cdot (\underline{\delta_{t-1}-1})!! \prod_{k\in[l],k\neq t}(\underline{\delta_k})!!} && \text{(by Equation (2.1))} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{(\underline{n-1})!\cdot(\underline{\delta_{t-1}})}{(\underline{i_1})!\cdot\prod_{k=1}^{l}(\underline{\delta_k})!!} & \text{if } \delta_{t-1} \equiv 0, \\ \frac{(\underline{n-1})!}{(\underline{i_1})!\cdot\prod_{k=1}^{l}(\underline{\delta_k})!!} & \text{if } \delta_{t-1} \not\equiv 0. \end{cases} && \text{(Using (3.2) with } k = \delta_{t-1}). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, since $\delta_m \not\equiv 0$ but $\delta_{t-1} \equiv 0$, for $t - 1 > m$,

$$f_{n-1,I^{(t)}}(X) = \begin{cases} \frac{(\underline{n-1})!\cdot(\underline{\delta_{t-1}})}{(\underline{i_1})!\cdot\prod_{k=1}^{l}(\underline{\delta_k})!!} & \text{if } t-1 > m, \\ \frac{(\underline{n-1})!}{(\underline{i_1})!\cdot\prod_{k=1}^{l}(\underline{\delta_k})!!} & \text{if } t-1 = m. \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

By substituting the right hand side of (3.3) into (3.1), we have to show

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(\underline{n})!}{(\underline{i_1})! \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{l}(\underline{\delta_k})!!} &= -X^n \cdot \frac{(\underline{n-1})!}{(\underline{i_1})! \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{l}(\underline{\delta_k})!!} + X^{n-i_{m+1}} \cdot \frac{(\underline{n-1})!}{(\underline{i_1})! \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{l}(\underline{\delta_k})!!} \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=m+2}^{l+1} X^{n-i_t} \cdot \frac{(\underline{n-1})! \cdot (\underline{\delta_{t-1}})}{(\underline{i_1})! \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{l}(\underline{\delta_k})!!}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Dividing both sides of Equation (3.4) by $\frac{(\underline{n-1})!}{(\underline{i_1})!\cdot\prod_{k=1}^{l}(\underline{\delta_k})!!}$ implies that it is equivalent to show

$$(\underline{n}) = X^{n-i_{m+1}} - X^n + \sum_{t=m+2}^{l+1} X^{n-i_t} \cdot (\underline{\delta_{t-1}}). \tag{3.5}$$

But, we have a telescoping series

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=m+2}^{l+1} X^{n-i_t} \cdot (\underline{\delta_{t-1}}) &= \sum_{t=m+2}^{l+1} X^{n-i_t} \cdot (1 - X^{i_t - i_{t-1}}) \\ &= \sum_{t=m+2}^{l+1} \left(X^{n-i_t} - X^{n-i_{t-1}}\right) \\ &= \sum_{t=m+2}^{l+1} X^{n-i_t} - \sum_{t=m+1}^{l} X^{n-i_t} \\ &= X^{n-n} + \sum_{t=m+2}^{l} X^{n-i_t} - \sum_{t=m+2}^{l} X^{n-i_t} - X^{n-i_{m+1}} \\ &= 1 - X^{n-i_{m+1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Therefore, using Equation (3.6), the right hand side of Equation (3.5) is

$$X^{n-i_{m+1}} - X^n + \sum_{t=m+2}^{l+1} X^{n-i_t} \cdot (\underline{\delta_{t-1}}) = X^{n-i_{m+1}} - X^n + 1 - X^{n-i_{m+1}} = 1 - X^n = (\underline{n}),$$

implying Equation (3.5) holds. □

4. The Combinatorial Induction

To prove the main result, Theorem 2.5, that $f_{n,I}(X) = S_{n,I}(X)$, we will show that $S_{n,I}(X)$ satisfies the same recurrence established for $f_{n,I}(X)$ in Proposition 3.2. In this section, we will explain how Theorem 4.3 implies Theorem 2.5. This will be accomplished by partitioning $C_n^{I^c}$ according to where the nonzero entry in the bottom row is, and then analyzing the sums restricted to elements in this partition. We first define notation needed to state Theorem 4.3.

Definition 4.1. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}, I \subset [n-1]_0$, with I arbitrary, and $z \in [n]_0$. Define

$$(C_n^{I^c})_z = \begin{cases} \{w \in C_n^{I^c} \mid w_{n,z} = 1\}, & \text{if } z \equiv n, \\ \{w \in C_n^{I^c} \mid w_{n,z+1} = -1\}, & \text{if } z \not\equiv n. \end{cases}$$

Observe that $C_n^{I^c} = \cup_{z=0}^{n} (C_n^{I^c})_z$ defines a partition of $C_n^{I^c}$.

Definition 4.2. Define $S_{n,I,i_k}(X) = \sum_{w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_k}} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)}$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_l\}_<, i_0 = 0, i_{l+1} = n$, and $\delta_k = i_{k+1} - i_k$. Let i_m be the greatest element of I such that δ_m is odd, assuming such an $i_m \in I$ exists. If such an i_m does not exist, let $m = -1$ and $i_m = -1$. Then,*

1. $\sum_{i_k < i_m} S_{n,I,i_k}(X) = 0$.
2. *For $m \geq 0$, $S_{n,I,i_m}(X) = -X^n \cdot f_{n-1,I^{(m+1)}}(X)$.*
3. *For $k \in \{m+1, \dots, l+1\}$ we have $S_{n,I,i_k}(X) = X^{n-i_k} \cdot f_{n-1,I^{(k)}}(X)$.*

In the rest of this section, we show why Theorem 4.3 implies Theorem 2.5.

Lemma 4.4. *We have the equality $S_{n,I}(X) = \sum_{i_k \in I \cup \{i_{l+1}\}} S_{n,I,i_k}(X)$.*

Proof. First, for each element w, there must be exactly one $i \in [n]$ such that $w_{n,i} = \pm 1$. Therefore, $S_{n,I}(X) = \sum_{z \in [n]_0} S_{n,I,z}(X)$. In fact, if $w \in C_n^{I^c}$, then $w \in \cup_{i_k \in I \cup \{i_{l+1}\}} (C_n^{I^c})_{i_k}$. This will prove the lemma, because we obtain

$$S_{n,I}(X) = \sum_{z \in [n]_0} S_{n,I,z}(X) = \sum_{i_k \in I \cup \{i_{l+1}\}} S_{n,I,i_k}(X),$$

as $S_{n,I,z} = 0$ if $z \notin I \cup \{i_{l+1}\}$.

In the above, we are using that if $w \in C_n^{I^c}$ then $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_k}$ for a unique $i_k \in I \cup \{i_{l+1}\}$. This holds because there is a unique nonzero entry in the bottom row of w. □

Proof of Theorem 2.5 assuming Theorem 4.3. We proceed by induction on n.

The base case: Theorem 2.5 holds when $n = 1$.

If $n = 1$, then either $I = \{0\}$ or $I = \emptyset$. If $n = 1, I = \{0\}$, then Theorem 2.5 holds by [4, Theorem 2 Case 1]. If $n = 1, I = \emptyset$, Theorem 2.5 holds because $C_n^{\emptyset^c} = \{\mathrm{id}\}$, so $S_{1,\emptyset}(X) = 1 = f_{1,\emptyset}(X)$.

The inductive step: Theorem 2.5 holds, assuming it holds with n replaced by $n-1$.

By Corollary 2.9, it suffices to prove that $S_{n,I}(X)$ satisfies the same recursion as $f_{n,I}(X)$. By Lemma 4.4, $S_{n,I}(X) = \sum_{i_k \in I \cup \{i_{l+1}\}} S_{n,I,i_k}(X)$. We now have three cases, depending on whether $i_k < i_m, i_k = i_m, i_k > i_m$.

We will only prove the case that $m \geq 0$, as the case that $m = -1$ is analogous. Using part 1 of Theorem 4.3, it follows that for $i_t \in I$ with $i_t < i_m$, we have $\sum_{i_t < i_m} S_{n,I,i_t}(X) = 0$. Combining this result with Lemma 4.4 gives us that $S_{n,I}(X) = \sum_{i_k \in I \cup \{i_{l+1}\}, i_k \geq i_m} S_{n,I,i_k}(X)$, Next, using part 2 of Theorem 4.3,

$$S_{n,I,i_m}(X) = -X^n \cdot f_{n-1,I^{(m+1)}}(X).$$

And finally, for $i_k > i_m$, we use part 3 of Theorem 4.3 to obtain

$$S_{n,I,i_k}(X) = X^{n-i_k} \cdot f_{n-1,I^{(k)}}(X).$$

Therefore, by induction,

$$S_{n,I}(X) = -X^n \cdot f_{n-1,I^{(m+1)}}(X) + \sum_{k=m+1}^{l+1} X^{n-i_k} \cdot f_{n-1,I^{(k)}}(X)$$
$$= -X^n \cdot S_{n-1,I^{(m+1)}}(X) + \sum_{k=m+1}^{l+1} X^{n-i_k} \cdot S_{n-1,I^{(k)}}(X).$$

Hence, by Proposition 3.2, $S_{n,I}(X)$ and $f_{n,I}(X)$ satisfy the same recurrence.

Hence, $f_{n,I}(X) = S_{n,I}(X)$, and Theorem 2.5 holds by Corollary 2.9. □

5. Swapping

5.1. **Swapping Definitions and Examples.** We will prove Theorem 4.3 in Corollary 6.6, Lemma 7.2, and Corollary 8.42. However, before doing so, we will need the swapping lemma, Lemma 5.9. The point of the Lemma 5.9 is to establish the properties of an involution on certain sets of "swappable" elements. Heuristically, swaps pairs of columns, whose corresponding rows can be interchanged (swapped). This involution will preserve L and change the sign of w. Hence, we can use this involution to cancel the contribution of all "swappable" elements to the sum $S_{n,I}(X)$, and restrict the sum to a much smaller set. For the remainder of Section 5, fix $n \in \mathbb{N}, I \subset [n-1]_0, w \in C_n$, and $k \in [n]$ a column index.

Definition 5.1. Let $w \in C_n$. A *k-swap for* w is a pair $(b,t) \in [n]_0^2$ such that all of the following hold:

(1) $b < t$
(2) $b \equiv t$
(3) if s is a row index with $\min(i(b), i(t)) < s < \max(i(b), i(t))$, then $j(s) > k$
(4) if $t > k$, then $b \neq 0$
(5) if $t > k$ and if s satisfies $\min(i(b), i(t)) < s < \max(i(b), i(t))$, then $w_{s,j(s)} = -w_{i(t),t}$
(6) if $b > k$, then $w_{i(b),b} = w_{i(t),t}$.

Let the set of *k-swaps for* w be $\mathrm{Swap}^k(w) = \{(b,t) \mid (b,t) \text{ is a } k\text{-swap for } w\}$.

We partition $\mathrm{Swap}^k(w)$ into the following named subsets, depending primarily on the relative positions of b, t, and k and the sign of $w_{i(t),t}$:

- Let the set of *k-sign swaps for* w be $\mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{sign}}(w) = \{(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k(w) \mid b = 0\}$.
- Let the set of *k-left swaps for* w be $\mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{left}}(w) = \{(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k(w) \mid b \neq 0, t \leq k\}$.
- Let the set of *k-single-plus swaps for* w be $\mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{sp}}(w) = \{(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k(w) \mid b \leq k < t, w_{i(t),t} = 1\}$.
- Let the set of *k-single-minus swaps for* w be $\mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{sm}}(w) = \{(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k(w) \mid b \leq k < t, w_{i(t),t} = -1\}$.
- Let the set of *k-double-plus swaps for* w be $\mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{dp}}(w) = \{(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k(w) \mid k < b, w_{i(t),t} = 1\}$.
- Let the set of *k-double-minus swaps for* w be $\mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{dm}}(w) = \{(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k(w) \mid k < b, w_{i(t),t} = -1\}$.

For $(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k(w)$, let $\{x,y\}_< = \{i(b), i(t)\}$ and define

$$\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w) = s_{y-1}s_{y-2}\cdots s_{x+1}s_x s_{x+1}\cdots s_{y-1}w.$$

Remark 5.2. Note that when $b = 0, \mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)$ is almost the same matrix as w, but with the sign of row $i(t)$ reversed. When $b \neq 0, \mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)$ is almost the same matrix as w, but with rows $i(b)$ and $i(t)$ interchanged. See Example 5.3 for pictorial examples.

Example 5.3. We now give examples of various elements in the set of k-swaps.

- Let w be as pictured below. Then, $(0,2) \in \mathrm{Swap}^3_{\mathrm{sign}}(w)$ because $2 \equiv 0$ and there are no entries in columns ≤ 3 which lie above row $i(2) = 2$.

$$w = \begin{array}{c} \begin{matrix} & t & k & & \end{matrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} & & & & 1 \\ & -1 & & & \\ 1 & & & & \\ & & & -1 & \\ & & 1 & & \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \qquad \mathrm{swap}_{(0,2)}(w) = \begin{array}{c} \begin{matrix} & t & k & & \end{matrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} & & & & 1 \\ & \textcircled{1} & & & \\ 1 & & & & \\ & & & -1 & \\ & & 1 & & \end{pmatrix} \end{array}.$$

- Let w be as pictured below. Then, $(1,3) \in \mathrm{Swap}^4_{\mathrm{left}}(w)$ because $3 - 1 \equiv 0$, the only row between row $i(1) = 3$ and row $i(3) = 5$ is row 4, and column $j(4) = 6$ is right of column 4.

$$w = \begin{array}{c} \begin{matrix} b & & t & k & & \end{matrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} & & & & -1 & \\ & 1 & & & & \\ 1 & & & & & \\ & & & & & 1 \\ & & -1 & & & \\ & & & 1 & & \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \qquad \mathrm{swap}_{(1,3)}(w) = \begin{array}{c} \begin{matrix} b & & t & k & & \end{matrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} & & & & -1 & \\ & 1 & & & & \\ \bullet & & -1 & & & \\ \downarrow & & \uparrow & & & 1 \\ 1 & & \bullet & & & \\ & & & 1 & & \end{pmatrix} \end{array}.$$

- Let w be as pictured below. Then, $(1,3) \in \mathrm{Swap}^2_{\mathrm{sm}}(w)$ because $3 - 1 \equiv 0$ and the row between row $i(1) = 3$ and row $i(3) = 1$ is row 2 with $w_{2,j(2)} = 1$.

$$w = \begin{array}{c} \begin{matrix} b & k & t & & & \end{matrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} & & -1 & & & \\ & & & 1 & & \\ 1 & & & & & \\ & & & & & 1 \\ & & & & 1 & \\ & 1 & & & & \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \qquad \mathrm{swap}_{(2,6)}(w) = \begin{array}{c} \begin{matrix} b & k & t & & & \end{matrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \bullet & & & \\ \uparrow & & \downarrow & & 1 & \\ \bullet & & -1 & & & \\ & & & & & 1 \\ & & & & 1 & \\ & 1 & & & & \end{pmatrix} \end{array}.$$

- Let w be as pictured below. Then, $(2,6) \in \mathrm{Swap}^1_{\mathrm{dm}}(w)$. Note that $6 - 2 \equiv 0$ and the only rows between row $i(2) = 2$ and row $i(6) = 6$ are rows $3, 4$, and 5 all of which

lie to the right of column 1 and have 1's in them.

$$w = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{ccccccc} k & & b & & & & t \end{array} \\ \left(\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & & & & & & \\ & -1 & & & & & \\ & & & & 1 & & \\ & & & 1 & & & \\ & & 1 & & & & \\ & & & & & & -1 \end{array}\right) \end{array}$$

$$\mathrm{swap}_{(2,6)}(w) = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{ccccccc} k & & b & & & & t \end{array} \\ \left(\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & & & & & & \\ & & \bullet & & & & -1 \\ & & \downarrow & & & 1 & \uparrow \\ & 1 & & & 1 & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & -1 & & & & \bullet \end{array}\right) \end{array}$$

.

Remark 5.4. The elements of sets $\mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{dp}}(w), \mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{dm}}(w)$ are reminiscent of type 1 "odd sandwiches in w," as described in [4, Definition 15]. Also, elements of $\mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{sign}}(w)$ are reminiscent of type 2 "odd sandwiches in w." We will soon define the maps $\mathrm{minSwap}^k_l, \mathrm{minSwap}^k_m, \mathrm{minSwap}^k_p$ in Definition 5.11, which are analogs of the odd sandwich involution $w \mapsto w^\vee$ as defined in [4, Definition 17]. In Subsections 5.2 and 5.3, we develop results for swaps similar to [4, Lemma 19] for odd sandwiches.

Example 5.5. We now give an example of $\mathrm{Swap}^4(w)$ for $w = [-9, 2, 5, 10, 3, 4, 7, -6, 1, -8]$. Writing w in permutation matrix notation,

$$w = \begin{pmatrix} & & & & & & & & 1 & \\ & 1 & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & 1 & & & & & \\ & & & & & 1 & & & & \\ & & & 1 & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & -1 & & \\ & & & & & & 1 & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & -1 \\ -1 & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & 1 & & & & & & \end{pmatrix}$$

Observe that $w \in C_{10}$, because $\forall i \in [10], i \equiv w(i)$. Also, $D(w) = \{0, 4, 7, 9\}$. We see

- $\mathrm{Swap}^4_{\mathrm{sign}}(w) = \{(0, 2)\}$
- $\mathrm{Swap}^4_{\mathrm{left}}(w) = \{(1, 3)\}$
- $\mathrm{Swap}^4_{\mathrm{dm}}(w) = \{(8, 10)\}$
- $\mathrm{Swap}^4_{\mathrm{sp}}(w) = \{(1, 7), (3, 7)\}$
- $\mathrm{Swap}^4_{\mathrm{sm}}(w) = \mathrm{Swap}^4_{\mathrm{dp}}(w) = \emptyset$.

As some non-examples, the following are not in the set of 4-swaps for w:

- $(2, 3) \notin \mathrm{Swap}^4_{\mathrm{left}}(w)$, because $2 \not\equiv 3$,
- $(3, 5) \notin \mathrm{Swap}^4_{\mathrm{sp}}(w)$, because $w_{4,6} = 1 \neq -w_{i(5),5}$,
- $(5, 9) \notin \mathrm{Swap}^4_{\mathrm{dp}}(w)$ because row 2 is row between row $i(5) = 3$ and row $i(9) = 1$, but $j(2) = 2 \not> 4$.

Definition 5.6. Define the set of *k-two-swaps for w* to be

$$\mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{two}}(w) = \mathrm{Swap}^k(w) \setminus \mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{sign}}(w),$$

Define the set of *general-left k-swaps for w*

$$\mathrm{Swap}^k_l(w) = \mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{sign}}(w) \cup \mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{left}}(w).$$

Define the set of *general-minus k-swaps for w*

$$\mathrm{Swap}^k_m(w) = \mathrm{Swap}^k(w) \setminus \mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{sp}}(w).$$

Define the set of *general-plus k-swaps for w*

$$\mathrm{Swap}_p^k(w) = \mathrm{Swap}^k(w) \setminus \mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{sm}}^k(w).$$

Informally, the set of general-left k-swaps for w is the set of all swaps which only alters columns to the left of k in w.

5.2. **The Swapping Lemma.** Having defined various sets of swaps, we next show that if $(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k(w)$, then the two matrices $w, \mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w) \in C_n$ have descent sets differing by at most one element, have the same value of L, and have opposite signs. We can then use these properties to cancel out certain elements w with $\mathrm{Swap}^k(w) \neq \emptyset$ from $S_{n,I}(X)$.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $w \in C_n$. For any $(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k(w)$, we have $D(w)\setminus\{k\} = D(\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))\setminus\{k\}$.*

Proof. First, note that $i \in D(w)$ is determined by whether $w(i) > w(i+1)$. Since $w(i) = (\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))(i)$ for $i \notin \{b,t\}$, we see that for $i \in [n-1]_0 \setminus \{b-1, b, t-1, t\}$, we have $i \in D(w) \iff i \in D(\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$. It only remains to deal with $i \in \{b-1, b, t-1, t\}$. Now, let $h \in \{b,t\}, m \in \{h+1, h-1\}$, and $i = \min(h,m)$. The only way we can fail to have $i \in D(w) \iff i \in D(\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$ is when $w(m)$ takes a value between $w(h)$ and $(\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))(h)$. If $h \leq k$, then property 3 in Definition 5.1 ensures $w(m)$ is not between $w(h)$ and $(\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))(h)$, unless $i = h = k$. If $h > k$, then properties 5 and 6 of Definition 5.1 ensure $w(m)$ is not between $w(h)$ and $(\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))(h)$, unless $i = m = k$. Therefore, if $i \neq k$, we have $i \in D(w) \iff i \in D(\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$, so $D(w) \setminus \{k\} = D(\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)) \setminus \{k\}$. □

Lemma 5.8. *Let $w \in C_n$. If $(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k(w)$, then $(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k(\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$.*

Proof. First, observe that if $(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{sign}}^k(w)$, we have $b = 0$ and by property 4 of Definition 5.1, $t \leq k$, so the last two conditions are vacuously satisfied. Since $\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)$ only differs from w in column t, by Remark 5.2 the first three conditions of Definition 5.1 hold, as they are independent of the value of $w_{i(t),t}$. If $(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{two}}^k(w) = \mathrm{Swap}^k(w) \setminus \mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{sign}}^k(w)$, by Remark 5.2, $i(b)$ and $i(t)$ are interchanged, and everything else is kept constant. Since all six conditions of Definition 5.1 still hold after $i(b)$ and $i(t)$ are interchanged, $(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k(\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$. □

Lemma 5.9 (Swapping Lemma)**.** *If $w \in C_n$ and (β,τ)[1] $\in \mathrm{Swap}^k(w)$, then*

$$L(w) = L(\mathrm{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w))$$
$$\mathrm{sgn}(w) = -\mathrm{sgn}(\mathrm{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)).$$

The idea of the proof of Lemma 5.9. The most difficult part of this proof is showing $L(w) = L(\mathrm{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w))$ when $(\beta,\tau) \in \mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{two}}^k(w)$. To do this, the idea is to break up $L(w)$ and $L(\mathrm{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w))$ as a sum of terms of the form $a(w), b_{j,j'}(w), c_{j,j'}(w)$. Since only columns β, τ differ between w and $\mathrm{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)$ we will have $b_{j,j'}(w) = b_{j,j'}(\mathrm{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)), c_{j,j'}(w) = c_{j,j'}(\mathrm{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w))$ when $\{\beta,\tau\} \cap \{j,j'\} = \emptyset$. Finally, by examining the relative position of $\beta, \tau, i(\beta), i(\tau)$, we compute that the remaining terms in $L(w)$ and $L(\mathrm{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w))$ sum to the same number.

Proof. We have $\mathrm{sgn}(w) = -\mathrm{sgn}(\mathrm{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w))$, since by definition 5.1, $\mathrm{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)$ is the product of an odd number of transpositions with w.

So, we only have to check that $L(w) = L(\mathrm{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w))$. For this, we use the abc Lemma, Lemma 2.12, and compute how a, b, c change. There are now two cases to verify, depending on whether $\beta = 0$.

The case of $(\beta,\tau) = (0,\tau) \in \mathrm{Swap}_{\mathsf{sign}}^k(w)$.

[1]For this proof only, use (β,τ) instead of (b,t), because we wish to reserve b for the function b as defined in Definition 2.10 and we don't want to use the confusing subscript b_b.

In this case, $a(w) = a(\text{swap}_{(0,\tau)}(w))$, because $\tau \equiv 0$ by Property 2 of Definition 5.1, and a only counts the number of $-1's$ in odd columns. Next, $b(w) = b(\text{swap}_{(0,\tau)}(w))$, because only the sign of row $i(\tau)$ changes. And finally, we check $c(w) = c(\text{swap}_{(0,\tau)}(w))$. By Property 3 of Definition 5.1, there are no column indices $j \in [n]$ $j < \tau, i(j) < i(\tau), j \equiv \tau$, so $c_t(w) = c_t(\text{swap}_{(0,\tau)}(w)) = 0$. Additionally, it is evident that $c_{j'}(w) = c_{j'}(\text{swap}_{(0,\tau)}(w))$ for $j' \neq t$. Hence, $c(w) = c(\text{swap}_{(0,\tau)}(w))$. Therefore,

$$a(w) + b(w) + 2c(w) = a(\text{swap}_{(0,\tau)}(w)) + b(\text{swap}_{(0,\tau)}(w)) + 2c(\text{swap}_{(0,\tau)}(w)),$$

and it follows that $L(w) = L(\text{swap}_{(0,\tau)}(w))$.

The case of $(\beta, \tau) \in \text{Swap}^k_{\text{two}}(w)$.

Of course $a(w) = a(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w))$ because for all row indices $i \in [n], j_w(i) = j_{\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)}(i)$. Using the abc Lemma, to complete the proof, it suffices to show $b(w) + 2c(w) = b(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)) + 2c(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w))$.

Observe that if $\{j, j'\} \cap \{\tau, \beta\} = \emptyset$, then

$$b_{j,j'}(w) = b_{j,j'}(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)) \tag{5.1}$$

$$c_{j,j'}(w) = c_{j,j'}(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)), \tag{5.2}$$

because both $i_w(j) = i_{\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)}(j)$ and $i_w(j') = i_{\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)}(j')$.

Sublemma 5.9.1. *Let $w \in C_n, (\beta, \tau) \in \text{Swap}^k_{two}(w)$. For any column index $j \in [n]$, define*

$$L_{\beta,\tau,j}(w) = \sum_{\substack{(x,y)\in[n]^2 \\ j\in\{x,y\} \\ \{x,y\}\cap\{\beta,\tau\}\neq\emptyset}} b_{x,y}(w) + 2c_{x,y}(w).$$

Then,

$$L_{\beta,\tau,j}(w) = L_{\beta,\tau,j}(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)). \tag{5.3}$$

Proof of Lemma 5.9 assuming Sublemma 5.9.1. As noted above, it suffices to show $b(w) + 2c(w) = b(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)) + 2c(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w))$. By Sublemma 5.9.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
b(w) + 2c(w) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{j'=1}^{n}(b_{j,j'}(w) + 2c_{j,j'}(w)) \\
&= \sum_{\{j,j'\}\cap\{\tau,\beta\}=\emptyset}(b_{j,j'}(w) + 2c_{j,j'}(w)) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} L_{\beta,\tau,j}(w) \\
&= \sum_{\{j,j'\}\cap\{\tau,\beta\}=\emptyset}(b_{j,j'}(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)) + 2c_{j,j'}(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w))) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{n} L_{\beta,\tau,j}(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{j'=1}^{n}(b_{j,j'}(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)) + 2c_{j,j'}(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w))) \\
&= b(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)) + 2c(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Sublemma 5.9.1. We prove this in cases, depending on where $i(j)$ lies above, below, or between $i(\beta)$ and $i(\tau)$. The case $i(j)$ is between $i(\beta)$ and $i(\tau)$ is proven by considering the three further sub-cases that j is right, left, or between β and τ.

Case 1: Row $i(j)$ is above both rows $i(\beta)$ and $i(\tau)$.

If $i_w(j)$ is above both $i_w(\beta)$ and $i_w(\tau)$, hence $i_{\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)}(j)$ is above both $i_{\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)}(\beta)$ and $i_{\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)}(\tau)$, we have $b_{x,y}(w) = b_{x,y}(\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$ and $c_{x,y}(w) = c_{x,y}(\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$ for all $(x,y) \in [n]^2$ with $j \in \{x,y\}, \{x,y\} \cap \{\beta,\tau\} = \emptyset$. Hence, Equation (5.3) holds in this case.

Case 2: Row $i(j)$ is above both rows $i(\beta)$ and $i(\tau)$.

This case is analogous to case 1.

Case 3: Row $i(j)$ is between rows $i(\beta)$ and $i(\tau)$.

Sub-case 3a: Column j is right of columns β and τ.

If j is right of β and right of τ, then

$$L_{\beta,\tau,j}(w) = b_{\beta,j}(w) + b_{\tau,j}(w) + 2c_{\beta,j}(w) + 2c_{\tau,j}(w),$$

as the other terms are 0. Now, for definiteness, assume $i(\beta) < i(\tau)$, and $j \not\equiv \beta$, as the other case is analogous. Then,

$$b_{\beta,j}(w) = 0, b_{\tau,j}(w) = 1, b_{\beta,j}(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)) = 1, b_{\tau,j}(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)) = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$b_{\beta,j}(w) + b_{\tau,j}(w) = b_{\beta,j}(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)) + b_{\tau,j}(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)).$$

Analogously,

$$c_{\beta,j}(w) + c_{\tau,j}(w) = c_{\beta,j}(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)) + c_{\tau,j}(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)),$$

and so $L_{\beta,\tau,j}(w) = L_{\beta,\tau,j}(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w))$ when j is right of β and right of τ.

Sub-case 3b: Column j is left of columns β and τ.

This sub-case is analogous to sub-case 3a.

Sub-case 3c: Column j is between columns β and τ.

In this sub-case,

$$L_{\beta,\tau,j}(w) = b_{\beta,j}(w) + b_{j,\tau}(w) + 2c_{\beta,j}(w) + 2c_{j,\tau}(w),$$

and

$$L_{\beta,\tau,j}(w) = 2 = L_{\beta,\tau,j}(\text{swap}_{(\beta,\tau)}(w)), \tag{5.4}$$

using the fact that $w_{i(j),j} \neq w_{i(\tau),\tau}$. We check this in the case that $j \not\equiv \beta, i(\beta) > i(\tau), w_{i(\beta),\beta} = w_{i(\tau),\tau} = 1$, and $w_{i(j),j} = -1$. Here,

$$b_{\beta,j}(w) = 1, b_{j,\tau}(w) = 1, c_{\beta,j}(\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)) = 1$$

and all other terms are 0, yielding Equation (5.4). The other cases are similar. □

5.3. **The Swapping Involution.** We have now shown that $(b,t) \in \text{Swap}^k(w)$ interacts nicely with L and sgn . These properties will allow us to cancel out many terms in $S_{n,I}(X)$. However, in order to do so, we will define several involutions on $C_n^{I^c}$.

Definition 5.10. Let $w \in C_n$. Define a total ordering, called the *swapping ordering*, on $\text{Swap}^k(w)$ by $(p,q) < (b,t)$ if $(i(p), i(q))$ comes lexicographically before $(i(b), i(t))$. More formally $(p,q) < (b,t)$ if either

- $\min(i(p), i(q)) < \min(i(b), i(t))$
- $\min(i(p), i(q)) = \min(i(b), i(t))$ and $\max(i(p), i(q)) < \max(i(b), i(t))$.

Definition 5.11. Define the map $\text{minSwap}_l^k : C_n^{I^c} \to C_n^{I^c}$, (respectively $\text{minSwap}_p^k : C_n^{I^c} \to C_n^{I^c}$, and $\text{minSwap}_m^k : C_n^{I^c} \to C_n^{I^c}$,) as follows. Let $w \in C_n^{I^c}$. If $\text{Swap}_l^k(w)$ (respectively $\text{Swap}_p^k(w), \text{Swap}_m^k(w)$, as defined in Definition 5.6) is nonempty, let $(b,t) \in \text{Swap}_l^k(w)$ (respectively $\text{Swap}_p^k(w), \text{Swap}_m^k(w)$) be the minimum element of $\text{Swap}_l^k(w)$ (respectively $\text{Swap}_p^k(w), \text{Swap}_m^k(w)$) taken with respect to the swapping ordering defined in Definition 5.10. Then, minSwap_l^k, (respectively $\text{minSwap}_p^k, \text{minSwap}_m^k$) is given by

$$w \mapsto \begin{cases} w & \text{if } \text{Swap}_l^k(w) = \emptyset \text{ (respectively } \text{Swap}_p^k(w) = \emptyset, \text{Swap}_m^k(w) = \emptyset), \\ \text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 5.12. *The maps* $\text{minSwap}_l^k, \text{minSwap}_p^k, \text{minSwap}_m^k$ *are all involutions on* $C_n^{I^c}$. *If* $\text{Swap}_l^k(w) \neq \emptyset$ (*respectively* $\text{Swap}_p^k(w) \neq \emptyset, \text{Swap}_m^k(w) \neq \emptyset$), *then*

$$L(w) = L(\text{minSwap}_l^k(w))$$
$$\text{sgn}(w) = -\text{sgn}(\text{minSwap}_l^k(w))$$

(*respectively*

$$L(w) = L(\text{minSwap}_p^k(w))$$
$$\text{sgn}(w) = -\text{sgn}(\text{minSwap}_p^k(w)), \text{ and}$$
$$L(w) = L(\text{minSwap}_m^k(w))$$
$$\text{sgn}(w) = -\text{sgn}(\text{minSwap}_m^k(w)) \text{).}$$

Proof. Let us prove the statement for the case of $\text{Swap}_m^k(w)$ since the proof of the case of $\text{Swap}_p^k(w)$ is analogous. The proof for the case of $\text{Swap}_l^k(w)$ follows since $\text{Swap}_l^k(W) \subset \text{Swap}_m^k(w)$.

By the Swapping Lemma, $L(\text{minSwap}_m^k(w)) = L(w)$ and $\text{sgn}(w) = -\text{sgn}(\text{minSwap}_m^k(w))$. So, it suffices to show that minSwap_m^k as defined is indeed an involution. Since $w = \text{swap}_{(b,t)}(\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$, it suffices to show that if (b,t) is minimum in $\text{Swap}_m^k(w)$, and (p,q) is minimum in $\text{Swap}_m^k(\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$, then $(b,t) = (p,q)$. (This statement is plausible as $(b,t) \in \text{Swap}_m^k(\text{swap}_{(b,t)}^k(w))$ by Lemma 5.8.) Since $\text{Swap}^k(w) = \text{Swap}_{\text{sign}}^k(w) \cup \text{Swap}_{\text{two}}^k(w)$, it suffices to show that none of the four cases below can occur, as this implies that the minimum $(p,q) \in \text{Swap}_m^k(\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$ is not less than the minimum $(b,t) \in \text{Swap}_m^k(w)$.

Case 1: The case $(b,t) \in \text{Swap}_{\text{sign}}^k(w)$, and $(p,q) \in \text{Swap}_{\text{sign}}^k(\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$ with $(p,q) < (b,t)$.

For this case, $b = p = 0$ by assumption. For any $v \in C_n^{I^c}, |\text{Swap}_{\text{sign}}^k(v)| \leq 1$, by property 3 of Definition 5.1. Since $(0,t) \in \text{Swap}_{\text{sign}}^k(\text{swap}_{(0,t)}(w))$ we have $\{(0,t)\} = \text{Swap}_{\text{sign}}^k(\text{swap}_{(0,t)}(w))$ so $q = t$.

Case 2: The case $(b,t) \in \text{Swap}_{\text{two}}^k(w)$, and $(p,q) \in \text{Swap}_{\text{sign}}^k(\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$ with $(p,q) < (b,t)$.

This cannot happen because $p = 0$, and $b > 0$, so $(b,t) < (p,q)$.

Case 3: The case $(b,t) \in \text{Swap}_{\text{two}}^k(w)$, and $(p,q) \in \text{Swap}_{\text{sign}}^k(\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$, with $(p,q) < (b,t)$.

Here, we automatically have $(p,q) < (b,t)$ since $b > 0, p = 0$. By assumption, $p = 0$. If $(b,t) \in \text{Swap}_{\text{dm}}^k(w) \cup \text{Swap}_{\text{dp}}^k(w)$, then $\text{Swap}_{\text{sign}}^k(\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)) = \emptyset$ since $\text{Swap}_{\text{sign}}^k(w) = \emptyset$ as the set of rows to the left of k in w and $\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)$ are the same.

Suppose instead that $(b,t) \in \text{Swap}_{\text{left}}^k(w) \cup \text{Swap}_{\text{sm}}^k(w)$. First, we must have either $(0,q) = (0,b)$ or $(0,q) = (0,t)$, since there are no column indices s such that $i_w(s)$ is row between $i_w(t)$ and $i_w(b)$ and $s \leq k$. If $i_w(b) < i_w(t)$, we must have $(0,q) = (0,t)$, but this would then imply that $(0,b) \in \text{Swap}_m^k(w)$, contradicting the assumption that (b,t) was the least element of $\text{Swap}^k(w)$.

So, the only remaining case is when $i_w(b) > i_w(t)$, and $(0,q) = (0,b)$. Observe that there are no row indices s with $s < \min(i_w(b), i_w(t))$ with $s \leq k$. Ergo, if $(0,b) \in \text{Swap}_{\text{sign}}^k(\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$, then $b \equiv 0$ and there must be no column indices $s < b$ and $i_w(s) < \min(i_w(b), i_w(t))$. But these two observations combined imply that $(0,t) \in \text{Swap}_m^k(w)$. contradicting the assumption that (b,t) was minimal in $\text{Swap}_m^k(w)$.

Case 4: The case $(b,t) \in \text{Swap}_{\text{two}}^k(w)$, and $(p,q) \in \text{Swap}_{\text{two}}^k(\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$ with $(p,q) < (b,t)$.

If $(b,t) \in \text{Swap}_{\text{dm}}^k(w) \cup \text{Swap}_{\text{dp}}^k(w) \cup \text{Swap}_{\text{left}}^k(w)$, then such a situation is impossible, since the set of rows and signs of the rows to the left of k and to the right of k in $\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)$ and w are the same, and hence $\text{Swap}^k(\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)) = \text{Swap}^k(w)$.

So, the only remaining case is when $(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{sm}}(w)$. If $i_w(b) < i_w(t)$, then if $(p,q) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{two}}(\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$, has $(p,q) < (b,t)$. The only possibility is that one of p,q is equal to t, and $(p,q) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{sm}}(\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)) \cup \mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{dm}}(\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$. For concreteness, let us say $q = t$, the other case is the same with p,q reversed. If $(p,q) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{sm}}(\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$, then one of (p,b) or (b,p) lies in $\mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{left}}(w)$, and is less than (b,t), contradicting the assumption that (b,t) was minimal in $\mathrm{Swap}^k_m(w)$. If instead, $(p,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{dm}}(\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w))$, then one of (b,p) or (p,b) would have been in $\mathrm{Swap}^k_{\mathrm{sm}}(w)$. Again, this contradicts the assumption that (b,t) was the least element of $\mathrm{Swap}^k_m(w)$.

An analogous argument goes through in the case $i_w(b) > i_w(t)$, with b,t reversed. □

6. Part 1 of Theorem 4.3

Using the the theory of swapping, we are able to prove part 1 of Theorem 4.3 in Corollary 6.6.

Notation 6.1. Recall $n \in \mathbb{N}, I = \{i_1, \dots, i_l\}_< \subset [n-1]_0, i_0 = 0$, and $i_{l+1} = n$. For Section 6 and Section 7, reserve the use of column index i_m for the column index of the same name defined in Theorem 4.3. In the case $m = i_m = -1$ parts 1 and 2 of Theorem 4.3 hold automatically. Therefore, for Sections 6 and 7, we will assume I is chosen so that $m \geq 0$.

Definition 6.2. Let $w \in B_n$, $k \in [n]$ be a column index, and $s,r \in [n]$ row indices with $r < s$. Denote $B_{r,s} = \{t \mid r \leq t \leq s\}$. Call $B_{r,s}$ a *k-block in w* if it satisfies the following conditions:

- For all $t \in B_{r,s}$, we have that $j_w(t) > k$.
- If $s \neq n$, then $j_w(s+1) \leq k$.
- If $r \neq 0$, then $j_w(r-1) \leq k$.

If $B_{r,s}$ is a k-block in w with $r \not\equiv s$, call $B_{r,s}$ an *even k-block in w*, since it contains an even number of rows. If instead $r \equiv s$, call $B_{r,s}$ an *odd k-block in w*. Notate the set of all k-blocks in w (respectively odd k-blocks in w, even k blocks in w) by $\mathrm{Block}^k(w)$ (respectively $\mathrm{OddBlock}^k(w), \mathrm{EvenBlock}^k(w)$).

Informally, a k-block in w is a maximal contiguous set of rows, all of which have entries right of column k.

Lemma 6.3. *Assume there is some $i_m \in I \cup \{i_{l+1}\}$, as defined in Notation 6.1. Let $i_b \in I \cup \{i_{l+1}\}$ with $i_b < i_m$. For all $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_b}$, then $\mathrm{OddBlock}^{i_m}(w) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Say $\mathrm{Block}^{i_m}(w) = \{B_{r_1,s_1}, B_{r_2,s_2}, \dots, B_{r_h,s_h}\}$. The total number of rows in all the i_m-blocks in w is equal to the number of columns right of i_m. For any p with $1 \leq p \leq h$, we have $|B_{r_p,s_p}| = r_p - s_p + 1$, and the number of columns to the right of i_m is $n - i_m$. So, $\sum_{p=1}^h (s_p - r_p + 1) = n - i_m$. Furthermore, since $n - i_m = \delta_m + \delta_{m+1} + \cdots + \delta_l \equiv \delta_m$ is odd, there exists a p for which $s_p - r_p + 1$ is odd, and so $\mathrm{OddBlock}^{i_m}(w) \neq \emptyset$. □

Lemma 6.4. *Assume there is some $i_m \in I \cup \{i_{l+1}\}$, as defined in Notation 6.1. If $i_k \in I \cup \{i_{l+1}\}, w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_k}$, and $B_{r,s} \in \mathrm{OddBlock}^{i_m}(w)$, with $i_k < i_m$, then $\mathrm{Swap}^{i_m}_l(w) \neq \emptyset$ and for all $(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^{i_m}_l(w)$, there exists $h \in [n]_0$ with $h < i_m$ and $\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w) \in (C_n^{I^c})_h$.*

Proof. Let $B_{r,s} \in \mathrm{OddBlock}^{i_m}(w)$. First, I claim $s \neq n$. Since $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_k}$, either $i(i_k) = n$ or $i(i_k+1) = n$. This is equivalent to $j(n) = i_k$ or $j(n) = i_k + 1$. Thus, $j(n) \leq i_m$, implying $s \neq n$, as $j(s) > i_m$.

If $r \neq 1$, then, since $s < n$, we obtain $s+1 \in [n]$, so $(j(r-1), j(s+1)) \in \mathrm{Swap}^{i_m}_{\mathrm{left}}(w)$, or $(j(s+1), j(r-1)) \in \mathrm{Swap}^{i_m}_{\mathrm{left}}(w)$. If $r = 1$, then $(0, j(s+1)) \in \mathrm{Swap}^{i_m}_{\mathrm{sign}}(w)$. Therefore, $\mathrm{Swap}^{i_m}_l(w) \neq \emptyset$.

Next, we show the second statement. First, we check $(j(n), i_m) \notin \mathrm{Swap}^{i_m}_l(w)$. If, instead, $(j(n), i_m) \in \mathrm{Swap}^{i_m}_l(w)$, then $j(n) \equiv i_m \not\equiv n$, contradicting the assumption that $j(n) \equiv n$. Hence, if (b,t) is so that $t = i_m$, then either $\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w) \in (C_n^{I^c})_{j_w(n)}$ or $\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w) \in$

$(C_n^{I^c})_{j_w(n)-1}$ because $b \neq j(n)$. Hence, $j_{\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)}(n) = j_w(n) < i_m$. If $t < i_m$, then either $j_{\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)}(n) = j_w(n) < i_m$ or $j_{\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)}(n) = t < i_m$, so again $\mathrm{swap}_{(b,t)}(w) \in (C_n^{I^c})_h$ with $h < i_m$.

□

Lemma 6.5. *Assume there is some $i_m \in I \cup \{i_{l+1}\}$, as defined in Notation 6.1. Let $w \in C_n^{I^c}$. Then, for any h, we have $\mathrm{OddBlock}^h(w) = \emptyset \implies \mathrm{Swap}_l^h(w) = \emptyset$. Consequently, if $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_k}$ with $i_k < i_m$, then $\mathrm{OddBlock}^{i_m}(w) = \emptyset \iff \mathrm{Swap}_l^{i_m}(w) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Assume $\mathrm{OddBlock}^h(w) = \emptyset$. First, suppose $(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{left}}^h(w)$. Then, if $i(b) < i(t)$, we have $B_{i(b)+1,i(t)-1} \in \mathrm{OddBlock}^h(w)$, while if $i(t) < i(b)$, we have $B_{i(t)+1,i(b)-1} \in \mathrm{OddBlock}^h(w)$. Therefore, $\mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{left}}^h(w) = \emptyset$. Next, if $(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{sign}}^h(w)$, then $B_{1,i(t)-1} \in \mathrm{OddBlock}^h(w)$. Therefore, $\mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{sign}}^h(w) = \emptyset$. Hence, $\mathrm{Swap}_l^h(w) = \mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{left}}^h(w) \cup \mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{sign}}^h(w) = \emptyset$.

For the second statement, the forward implication holds by the preceding paragraph, while the reverse direction holds by Lemma 6.4. □

Corollary 6.6. *Part 1 of Theorem 4.3 holds.*

Proof. Let $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_b}$, with $i_b < i_m$. Using Lemma 6.3, $\mathrm{OddBlock}^{i_m}(w) \neq \emptyset$. But then, by Lemma 6.5, $\mathrm{Swap}_l^{i_m}(w) \neq \emptyset$, and so by Lemma 5.12 the map $\mathrm{minSwap}_l^{i_m}$, defines a sign reversing involution, L preserving involution on all such elements. Observe that this involution from Lemma 5.12 restricts to an involution on the set $\{w \in C_n^{I^c} \mid w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_b} \text{ with } i_b < i_m\}$ by the last part of Lemma 6.4. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i_k < i_m} S_{n,I,i_k}(X) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i_k < i_m} \left(\sum_{w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_k}} (-1)^{l(w)} L(w) + \sum_{w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_k}} (-1)^{l(w)} L(w) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i_k < i_m} \left(\sum_{w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_k}} (-1)^{l(w)} L(w) + \sum_{w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_k}} (-1)^{l(\mathrm{minSwap}_l^k(w))} L(\mathrm{minSwap}_l^k(w)) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i_k < i_m} \left(\sum_{w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_k}} (-1)^{l(w)} L(w) - \sum_{w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_k}} (-1)^{l(w)} L(w) \right) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

7. Part 3 of Theorem 4.3 Implies Part 2 of Theorem 4.3

In this section, we present a bijection between $(C_n^{I^c})_{i_m}$ and $(C_n^{J^c})_{i_m+1}$, where $J = \{i_1, \ldots, i_{m-1}, i_m + 1, i_{m+1}, \ldots, i_l\}$, given by flipping the sign of the entry in the bottom row. Using direct computation in Lemma 7.1 we show that both L and sgn change nicely under this bijection, which will allow us reduce the proof part 2 of Theorem 4.3 to part 3 of Theorem 4.3. After this section, we prove part 3 of Theorem 4.3.

Lemma 7.1. *Assume there is some $i_m \in I$, as defined in Notation 6.1, and let $J = \{i_1, \ldots, i_{m-1}, i_m + 1, i_{m+1}, \ldots, i_l\}$. Define maps*

$$\begin{aligned}
f : (C_n^{I^c})_{i_m} &\to (C_n^{J^c})_{i_m+1} \\
w &\mapsto s_{n-1} s_{n-2} \cdots s_1 s_0 s_1 \cdots s_{n-1} w, \\
g : (C_n^{J^c})_{i_m+1} &\to (C_n^{I^c})_{i_m} \\
w &\mapsto s_{n-1} s_{n-2} \cdots s_1 s_0 s_1 \cdots s_{n-1} w,
\end{aligned}$$

where $s_0, \ldots, s_n$ are the Coxeter generators of B_n. Then, f, g are mutual inverses and for any $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_m}$, we have $\mathrm{sgn}(g(w)) = -\mathrm{sgn}(w)$ and $L(g(w)) + i_m + 1 = L(w)$.

Proof. First, note that f indeed sends $(C_n^{I^c})_{i_m} \to (C_n^{J^c})_{i_m+1}$ since it sends the matrix w to a signed permutation matrix which only differs from w in that the entry in the bottom row is changed from a "-1" to a "1". The fact that f and g are mutual inverses is immediate from the definition. The fact that $\operatorname{sgn}(g(w)) = -\operatorname{sgn}(w)$ holds since g is multiplication by an odd number of transpositions.

Finally, we check $L(g(w)) + i_m + 1 = L(w)$. Note that since $n - i_m$ is odd, we necessarily have $w_{n,i_m+1} = -1$, by Definition 4.1 We now use the abc Lemma to compute L. First, observe $b(w) = b(g(w))$, since $b_k(w) = b_k(g(w))$ for $k \in [n]$.

To compute $a(g(w))$ and $c(g(w))$ in terms of $a(w), c(w)$, and i_m we have two cases: either n is even or n is odd. We just check the case n is even, since the case n is odd is similar. If n is even, then $i_m + 1$ is even, which means there $\frac{i_m+1}{2}$ odd columns less than $i_m + 1$. This tells us that $c_{i_m+1}(w) = \frac{i_m+1}{2}$, and $c_{i_m+1}(g(w)) = 0$. Additionally, $c_k(w) = c_k(g(w))$ for $k \neq i_m + 1$. Also, since $i_m + 1$ is even, $a(w) = a(g(w))$. This tells us that

$$\begin{aligned} L(w) - L(g(w)) &= a(w) - a(g(w)) + b(w) - b(g(w)) + 2c(w) - 2c(g(w)) \\ &= 0 + 0 + 2c_{i_m+1}(w) \\ &= 2 \cdot \frac{i_m + 1}{2} \\ &= i_m + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $L(g(w)) + i_m + 1 = L(w)$. □

Lemma 7.2. *Assuming part 3 of Theorem 4.3, part 2 holds.*

Proof. Let $J = \{i_1, \dots, i_{m-1}, i_m + 1, i_{m+1}, \dots, i_l\}$. Using the function g as defined in Lemma 7.1, and the properties of g proven there,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_m}} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)} &= \sum_{w \in (C_n^{I^c})_{i_m}} -(-1)^{l(g(w))} X^{L(g(w))+i_m+1} && \text{(by Lemma 7.1)} \\ &= \sum_{u \in (C_n^{J^c})_{i_m+1}} -(-1)^{l(u)} X^{L(u)+i_m+1} && \text{(by Lemma 7.1)} \\ &= -X^{i_m+1} \sum_{u \in (C_n^{J^c})_{i_m+1}} (-1)^{l(u)} X^{L(u)} \\ &= -X^{i_m-1} X^{n-(i_m-1)} f_{n,J^{(m)}}(X) && \text{(by Theorem 4.3 part 3)} \\ &= -X^n f_{n,J^{(m)}}(X) \\ &= -X^n f_{n,I^{(m+1)}}(X) && \text{(since } J^{(m)} = I^{(m+1)}\text{).} \end{aligned}$$

□

8. Part 3 of Theorem 4.3

The idea of the proof of part 3 of Theorem 4.3: We define a bijection between elements $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$ with $\operatorname{Swap}_m^j(w) = \emptyset$ and elements of $v \in C_n^{(I^{(r)})^c}$ with $\operatorname{Swap}_p^{j-1}(v) = \emptyset$, where j, r are defined in Notation 8.1 below. This bijection is given in Algorithm 8.5.

Notation 8.1. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}, I = \{i_1, \dots, i_l\}_<, i_0 = 0$, and $i_{l+1} = n$. Let $r \in [l+1]_0$ be so that $\delta_k \equiv 0$ whenever $r \leq k \leq l$. Because this condition is vacuously satisfied $r = l + 1$, such an r always exists. **For the remainder of the paper,** use j to denote the fixed column index i_r. By Definition 4.1, if $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$ we have $w_{i(j),j} = 1$.

8.1. Initially Uncanceled Elements.

In order to define initially uncanceled elements in Definition 8.5, we first need some terminology.

Definition 8.2. Let $k \in [n]_0, w \in (C_n^{I^c})_k$, and $t \in [n-1]$. For any of the four possible values $(\pm 1, \pm 1)$, say w has a $(\pm 1, \pm 1)_t^k$ *pair* if

- $(\pm 1, \pm 1) = (w_{i(t),t}, w_{i(t+1),t+1})$

- $t \not\equiv n$
- $t > k$

Remark 8.3. Suppose $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$. Note that we cannot have any t for which w has a $(1,-1)_t^j$ pair, as for any column t which is right of column j with $t \not\equiv n$, we have $t \notin D(w)$. Hence, the only possibilities are $(1,1)_t^j, (-1,-1)_t^j$ and $(-1,1)_t^j$ pairs.

We next define blocks of ones and blocks of minus ones. Blocks of ones are subsets of blocks which are maximal sets of adjacent rows with all 1's, while blocks of minus ones are subsets of blocks which are maximal sets of adjacent rows with all -1's. More formally:

Definition 8.4. Let $w \in B_n$. Let $s, r \in [n]$ be row indices with $r \leq s$. Call the set of row indices $B_{r,s} = \{t \mid r \leq t \leq s\}$ a *k-block of ones in w* if

- For all $t \in B_{r,s}$, we have $w_{i(t),t} = 1$ and $j(t) > k$.
- If $s \neq n$, then $j(s+1) \leq k$ or $w_{s+1,j(s+1)} = -1$.
- If $r \neq 0$, then $j(r-1) \leq k$ or $w_{r-1,j(r-1)} = -1$.

If $r \not\equiv s$, then $B_{r,s}$ is called an *even k-block of ones*, and, if $r \equiv s$, then $B_{r,s}$ is called an *odd k-block of ones*.

Call the set of row indices $B_{r,s} = \{t \mid r \leq t \leq s\}$ a *k-block of minus ones in w* if

- For all $t \in B_{r,s}$, we have $w_{i(t),t} = -1$ and $j(t) > k$.
- If $s \neq n$, then $j(s+1) \leq k$ or $w_{s+1,j(s+1)} = 1$.
- If $r \neq 0$, then $j(r-1) \leq k$ or $w_{r-1,j(r-1)} = 1$.

If $r \not\equiv s$, then $B_{r,s}$ is called an *even k-block of minus ones in w*, and, if $r \equiv s$, then $B_{r,s}$ is called an *odd k-block of minus ones in w*.

Notate the set of all k-blocks of ones in w (respectively even k-blocks of ones in w, odd k blocks of ones in w, k-blocks of minus ones in w, even k-blocks of minus ones in w, odd k-blocks of minus ones in w) by $\text{PlusBlock}^k(w)$ (respectively $\text{EvenPlusBlock}^k(w)$, $\text{OddPlusBlock}^k(w), \text{MinusBlock}^k(w), \text{EvenMinusBlock}^k(w), \text{OddMinusBlock}^k(w)$).

Definition 8.5. Let $I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_l\}$ and fix $k \in I \cup \{n\}$ such that $k \equiv i$ for all $i \in I \cup \{n\}$ with $i > k$. An element $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_k$ is *k-initially uncanceled* if its signed permutation matrix satisfies the following properties.

(1) Either $j(n-1)$ is left of k or $w_{n-1,j(n-1)} = -1$.
(2) $\text{OddBlock}^k(w) = \emptyset$.
(3) Suppose t is a row index so that $w_{t,j(t)} = 1, t$ lies to the right of k, and there is no $s \in [n]$ with $s \geq t$ so that $B_{1,s} \in \text{OddPlusBlock}^k(w)$. Then, there is some $B_{r,s} \in \text{EvenPlusBlock}^k(w)$ with $r \leq t \leq s$.
(4) If n is even, there is no $t \in [n-1]$ for which w has a $(-1,1)_t^k$ pair. If n is odd, there is at most one $t \in [n-1]$ for which w has a $(-1,1)_t^k$ pair, and if w has such a pair, then $i(t+1) = 1$. Furthermore, $B_{1,i(t)-1} \in \text{PlusBlock}^k(w)$.
(5) If t is so that w has a $(-1,-1)_t^k$ pair, then either $i(t+1)+1 = i(t)$ or $B_{i(t+1)+1,i(t)-1} \in \text{EvenPlusBlock}^k(w)$.
(6) If $B_{p,q} \in \text{MinusBlock}^k(w)$ and $B_{r,s} \in \text{Block}^k(w)$ with $r > 1, B_{p,q} \subset B_{r,s}$, and $B_{p,q} \neq B_{r,s}$, then $B_{p,q} \in \text{OddMinusBlock}^k(w)$ if and only if $p = r$ or $q = s$.
(7) If $r > 1$ and s are row indices with $B_{r,s} \in \text{Block}^k(w)$, and q is a row index with $B_{r,q} \in \text{PlusBlock}^k(w)$ (respectively $B_{p,s} \in \text{PlusBlock}^k(w)$), then $q = s$ (respectively $p = r$).

We notate $(U_n^{I^c})_k = \{w \in (C_n^{I^c})_k \mid w \text{ is } k\text{-initially uncanceled}\}$.

Example 8.6. Take

$$w = \begin{pmatrix} & & & & & 1 & & \\ & & & & & & 1 & \\ & & & 1 & & & & \\ & & & & 1 & & & \\ 1 & & & & & & & \\ & & -1 & & & & & \\ & & & & & & 1 & \\ & & & & & & & 1 \\ & -1 & & & & & & \\ 1 & & & & & & & \end{pmatrix}$$

Here, $w \in (U_{10}^{\{2,6\}^c})_2$. To see this, note $D(w) = \{2,6\}$. Property 1 holds because $w_{9,3} = -1$. Property 2 holds because $B_{1,4} \in \text{EvenBlock}^2(w)$ and $B_{6,9} \in \text{EvenBlock}^2(w)$. Property 3 holds because $B_{7,8} \in \text{EvenPlusBlock}^k(w)$ and rows $1,2,3,4$ also determine $B_{1,4} \in \text{EvenPlusBlock}^2(w)$. Property 4 is satisfied because there are no t for which w has a $(-1,1)_t^2$ pair. Property 5 holds because columns $3,4$ are to the right of 2, and the only rows between $i(3) = 9$ and $i(4) = 6$ are rows 7 and 8 which both contain $+1's$ to the right of 2. Property 6 holds because the only times $B_{p,q} \subset B_{r,s}, B_{p,q} \neq B_{r,s}$ are when $(r,s) = (6,9)$ and either $p = q = 6$ or $p = q = 9$, but in both cases $B_{p,q} \in \text{OddMinusBlock}^2(w)$. Finally, property 7 is satisfied because in $B_{1,4}$ there are no rows with a "-1," and in $B_{6,9}$, the top and bottom rows are -1's.

8.2. **Equivalence of Initially Uncanceled and an empty set of General-Minus j-Swaps.** We show in Theorem 8.22 that $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$ satisfies the seven properties j-initially uncanceled matrices of Definition 8.5 if and only if $\text{Swap}_m^j(w) = \emptyset$. The if direction is much harder, since we must verify each of the seven properties of j initially uncanceled matrices, one at a time, assuming $\text{Swap}_m^j(w) = \emptyset$.

8.2.1. *Property 1.*

Lemma 8.7. *Let $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$ with $\text{Swap}_m^j(w) \neq \emptyset$. We can not have both that column $j(n-1)$ lies to the right of j and $w_{n-1,j(n-1)} = 1$.*

Proof. Suppose column $j(n-1)$ lies to the right of j and $w_{n-1,j(n-1)} = 1$.. Since $j(n-1) \not\equiv n$, we have $j(n-1) \notin D(w)$. Hence, the only possibility is that $w_{n,j(n-1)+1} = 1$, contradicting the assumption that $j(n-1) > j$ and $w_{n,j} = 1$. □

The next lemma is crucial, as while Lemma 5.12 allows us to cancel out elements of $C_n^{I^c}$ with $\text{minSwap}_m^j \neq \emptyset$ from $S_{n,I}(X)$, the next lemma allows us to cancel out the contributions of elements from $(C_n^{I^c})_j$ with $\text{minSwap}_m^j \neq \emptyset$ from $S_{n,I,j}$.

Lemma 8.8. *The involution $\text{minSwap}_m^j : C_n^{I^c} \to C_n^{I^c}$ defined in Lemma 5.12 restricts to an involution $\text{minSwap}_m^j : (C_n^{I^c})_j \to (C_n^{I^c})_j$.*

Proof. Since we have shown that minSwap_m^j defines an involution on $C_n^{I^c}$ in Lemma 5.12, it suffices to show that we have a containment $\text{minSwap}_m^j(C_n^{I^c})_j \subset (C_n^{I^c})_j$. That is, we will show that if $w \in C_n^{I^c}$ and (b,t) is the minimum element of $\text{Swap}_m^j(w)$, so that $\text{minSwap}_m^j(w) = \text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)$, then $b \neq j, t \neq j$. First, suppose $(b,t) \in \text{Swap}_l^j(w)$ with $t = m$. Then, $\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 6.4, so $\text{minSwap}_l^{i_m}(\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)) \notin (C_n^{I^c})_j$. Hence, $\text{minSwap}_l^{i_m}(\text{swap}_{(b,t)}(w)) \neq w$, contradicting Lemma 5.12. Next, if $(b,t) \in \text{Swap}_{\text{dm}}^j(w) \cup \text{Swap}_{\text{dp}}^j(w)$, then $j < b < t$. The only other possibility is that $(j,t) = (b,t) \in \text{Swap}_{\text{sm}}^j(w)$. This would necessarily imply $j(n-1)$ is to the right of j and $w_{n-1,i(n-1)} = 1$, contradicting Lemma 8.7. Therefore, column j will never be involved in the least swap of w, and so $\text{minSwap}_m^j : C_n^{I^c} \to C_n^{I^c}$ restricts to a map $\text{minSwap}_m^j : (C_n^{I^c})_j \to (C_n^{I^c})_j$. □

8.2.2. *Property 2.* This was already shown in Lemma 6.4.

8.2.3. *Property 3.*

Lemma 8.9. *Any matrix* $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$ *with* $\mathrm{Swap}_m^j(w) = \emptyset$ *has* $\mathrm{OddPlusBlock}^j(w) = \emptyset$ *or* $\mathrm{OddPlusBlock}^j(w) = \{B_{1,s}\}$ *for some* $s \in [n]$.

Proof. Suppose $B_{r,s} \in \mathrm{OddPlusBlock}^j(w)$, with $r \neq 1$. Then, observe $(r-1, s+1) \in \mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{left}}^j(w) \cup \mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{dm}}^j(w) \cup \mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{sm}}^j(w)$, since the rows $r-1$ and $s+1$ must either be to the left of j or have -1's, by definition of odd j-block of ones. □

8.2.4. *Some Intermediate Lemmas.*

Lemma 8.10. *If* $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$ *has* $\mathrm{Swap}_m^j(w) = \emptyset$ *and* $B_{r,s} \in \mathrm{EvenBlock}^j(w)$*, then there cannot be* $B_{p,q} \in \mathrm{OddMinusBlock}^j(w)$ *with* $r < p < q < s$.

Proof. If $B_{p,q} \in \mathrm{OddMinusBlock}^j(w)$ with $r < p < q < s$, then $(p-1, q+1) \in \mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{dp}}^j(w)$. □

Definition 8.11. Let $w \in B_n, k \in [n]$ and define

$$s_e^k(w) = \{h \in [n] \mid h > k, h \equiv 0, w_{i(h),h} = -1\},$$

$$s_o^k(w) = \{h \in [n] \mid h > k, h \equiv 1, w_{i(h),h} = -1\}.$$

Also, for each $h \in [n]$ with $h > k, w_{j(h),h} = -1$, let

$$up_h^k(w) = |\{t \in [k-1] \mid i(t) < i(h)\}|.$$

Then define

$$u_e^k(w) = \{h \in [n] \mid h > k, w_{i(h),h} = -1, |up_h^k(w)| \equiv 0\}$$

$$u_o^k(w) = \{h \in [n] \mid h > k, w_{i(h),h} = -1, |up_h^k(w)| \equiv 1\}.$$

For $a, b \in \{o, e\}$ let $u_a^j(w)s_b^j(w) = u_a^j(w) \cap s_b^j(w)$.

For $B_{r,s} \in \mathrm{EvenBlock}^k(w)$, define $\mathrm{minus}_{B_{r,s}} = \{t \in B_{r,s} \mid w_{t,j(t)} = -1\}$.

Remark 8.12. Note, the subscript e stands for even and the subscript o stands for odd. These statistics are crucial for seeing how L changes when apply Algorithm 8.5.

Lemma 8.13. *Let* $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$ *with* $\mathrm{Swap}_m^j(w) = \emptyset$*. For any* $B_{r,s} \in \mathrm{EvenBlock}^j(w)$ *with* $r \neq 1$*, then* $|\,\mathrm{minus}_{B_{r,s}} \cap s_e^j(w)| = |\,\mathrm{minus}_{B_{r,s}} \cap s_o^j(w)|$*. If* $r = 1$*, then*

$$\big||\,\mathrm{minus}_{B_{r,s}} \cap s_e^j(w)| - |\,\mathrm{minus}_{B_{r,s}} \cap s_o^j(w)|\big| = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } |\,\mathrm{minus}_{B_{r,s}}\,| \equiv 1, \\ 0, & \text{if } |\,\mathrm{minus}_{B_{r,s}}\,| \equiv 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. First, consider the case that $B_{r,s} \in \mathrm{EvenBlock}^j(w)$ with $r \neq 1$. Then, whenever some $t \in B_{r,s}$ satisfies $w_{t,j(t)} = 1$, we know by Lemma 8.9 that there is some, $B_{a,b} \in \mathrm{EvenPlusBlock}^j(w)$ with $a \leq t \leq b$. Write $\mathrm{minus}_{B_{r,s}} = \{k_1, \ldots, k_p\}_<$. First observe that by Lemma 6.4, p must be even, since $|B_{r,s}| \equiv 0$, and $|\{t \in B_{r,s} \mid w_{t,j(t)} = 1\}| \equiv 0$, as $\{t \in B_{r,s} \mid w_{t,j(t)} = 1\}$ is a disjoint union of sets of even cardinality. So $|B_{r,s}| - |\{t \in B_{r,s} \mid w_{t,j(t)} = 1\}| = |\,\mathrm{minus}_{B_{r,s}}\,|$ is also even. Next, note that for $1 \leq i \leq p-1$, either $k_i + 1 = k_{i+1}$, or else $B_{k_i+1,k_{i+1}-1} \in \mathrm{EvenPlusBlock}^j(w)$. This tells us that $k_i \not\equiv k_{i+1}$. Therefore, for any $B_{r,s} \in \mathrm{EvenBlock}^j(w)$, such that $r \neq 1$, we must have $|\,\mathrm{minus}_{B_{r,s}} \cap s_e^j(w)| = |\,\mathrm{minus}_{B_{r,s}} \cap s_o^j(w)|$.

In the case that $r = 1$, the argument from the previous paragraph shows that the parities of the row indices in $\mathrm{minus}_{B_{r,s}}$ must alternate. However, if $r = 1, |\,\mathrm{minus}_{B_{r,s}}\,|$ may be either even or odd. Hence, $\big||\,\mathrm{minus}_{B_{r,s}} \cap s_e^j(w)| - |\,\mathrm{minus}_{B_{r,s}} \cap s_o^j(w)|\big|$ will either be 0 or 1 depending on whether $|\,\mathrm{minus}_{B_{r,s}}\,|$ is even or odd, as claimed. □

Lemma 8.14. *Any* $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$ *with* $\mathrm{Swap}_m^j(w) = \emptyset$ *can have at most one* $(-1,1)_t^j$ *pair. Furthermore* w *has a* $(-1,1)_t^j$ *pair if and only if there is some* $q \in [n]$ *for which* $B_{1,q} \in \mathrm{OddPlusBlock}^j(w)$.

Proof. For definiteness, let us take the case that $n \equiv 0$. The case $n \equiv 1$ is exactly analogous, simply by reversing the roles of even and odd.

Since n is even, if w has a $(-1,1)^j_m$ pair, then m is odd, because by Definition 8.2 $m \not\equiv n$. So, if there were any $(-1,1)^j_m$ pairs, we must have $u^j_o(w) > u^j_e(w)$, by Remark 8.3.

By Lemma 8.13 we know that for any $B_{r,s} \in \text{EvenBlock}^j(w)$, with $r \neq 1$, $|\text{minus}_{B_{r,s}} \cap s^j_e(w)| = |\text{minus}_{B_{r,s}} \cap s^j_o(w)|$. By Remark 8.3, the number $t \in [n-1]$ for which w has a $(-1,1)^j_t$ pair is exactly the difference $\sum_{B_{r,s} \in \text{Block}^j(w)} \left(|\text{minus}_{B_{r,s}} \cap s^j_o(w)| - |\text{minus}_{B_{r,s}} \cap s^j_e(w)| \right)$. By Lemma 8.13, this is 0 if there are no s for which $B_{1,s} \in \text{EvenBlock}^j(w)$, and is $|\text{minus}_{B_{1,s}}| \bmod 2$ if there is such an s. This shows there is at most one t for which w has a $(-1,1)^j_t$ pair.

To see the second statement, note that, $|\text{minus}_{B_{1,s}}| \equiv 1$ if and only if $\text{OddPlusBlock}^j(w) \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 8.9 the only way there is some $B_{p,q} \in \text{OddPlusBlock}^j(w)$ with $B_{p,q} \subset \text{minus}_{B_{1,s}}$ is if $p = 1$. Hence w has a single $(-1,1)^j_t$ pair if and only if $B_{p,q} \in \text{OddPlusBlock}^j(w)$, with $p = 1$. □

Lemma 8.15. *Let $w \in (C^{I^c}_n)_j$ with $\text{Swap}^j_m(w) = \emptyset$. If $B_{r,s} \in \text{Block}^j(w)$ and $t \in B_{r,s}$, so that $t \not\equiv n$ and $w_{t,j(t)} = 1$, then $w_{t+1,j(t)+1} = 1$.*



FIGURE 1. A schematic representation of the infinite descent in the proof of Lemma 8.15.

Proof. We know that column $j(t)+1$ must have a 1 as $t \notin D(w)$ because $t \not\equiv n$. So, to complete the proof, we only need to show that $j(t+1) = j(t)+1$. Suppose instead $j(t+1) \neq j(t)+1$. Now, we will show we get stuck in an infinite descent. Let $c = i(j(t)+1)$. Then, $w_{c,j(c)} = 1$, and either $w_{c-1,j(c-1)} = 1$, or there is some $B_{b_1,t_1} \in \text{EvenPlusBlock}^j(w)$, with $c \in B_{b_1,t_1}$, by Lemma 8.9. So, either $w_{c-1,j(c-1)} = 1$, and lies to the right of j or else row $c = b_1$.

Suppose we are in the former case, that $w_{c-1,j(c-1)} = 1$, and row $c-1$ and lies to the right of j. Define $t_2 = c-1$. We know $j(t_2)$ is not equal to $c-1$, since $j(t) = c-1$, and by assumption $j(t)+1 \neq j(t+1)$. Therefore, since $t_2 \not\equiv n$, we are again in the same situation as before, except t is replaced by t_2.

In the latter case that $c \in B_{c,t_1}$ is handled similarly, by applying the argument of the preceding paragraph to $w_{t_1,j(t_1)}$ instead of $w_{c-1,j(c-1)}$.

In both cases, we can repeat the above argument indefinitely, and we will be forced to move down the matrix indefinitely. This implies n is unbounded, which is a contradiction. □

8.2.5. *Property 4.*

Lemma 8.16. *Let $w \in (C^{I^c}_n)_j$ with $\text{Swap}^j_m(w) = \emptyset$. If n is even, there is no $t \in [n-1]$ so that w has a $(-1,1)^j_t$ pair.*

Proof. Assume w has some $(-1,1)_t^j$ pair. Let $B_{1,s} \in \text{Block}^j(w)$. We saw in Lemma 8.14 that there is $B_{1,q} \in \text{OddPlusBlock}^j(w)$ with $q \geq s$. However, we must then have $w_{q+1,j(q+1)} = -1$ and $q+1$ is to the right of j. This is because if the element in row $q+1$ were to the left of j, we would have $B_{1,s} = B_{1,q}$ which would imply $B_{1,s} \in \text{OddBlock}^j(w)$, which we cannot have by Lemma 6.4

Therefore, $w_{q+1,j(q+1)} = -1$. We know $q \not\equiv n \equiv 0$, so $q \equiv 1 \not\equiv n$. But then, by Lemma 8.15, if follows that $w_{q+1,i(q)+1} = 1$, contradicting $w_{q+1,j(q+1)} = -1$, since a signed permutation matrix can only have one nonzero entry in each row. Therefore, w has no $(-1,1)_t^j$ pairs. □

Lemma 8.17. *Let $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$ with $\text{Swap}_m^j(w) = \emptyset$. If n is odd, there is at most one $t \in [n-1]$ for which w has a $(-1,1)_t^j$ pair, and if such a pair exists, then $i(t+1) = 1$ and $B_{1,i(t)-1} \in \text{OddPlusBlock}^j(w)$.*

Proof. In Lemma 8.14, it was shown that there is at most one $t \in [n-1]$ for which w has a $(-1,1)_t^j$ pair. All that remains to check is that $i(t+1) = 1$, and $B_{1,i(t)-1} \in \text{OddPlusBlock}^j(w)$. First, will show that $i(t+1) = 1$. By Lemma 8.14, we know $w_{1,j(1)} = 1$. Note that $j(1)$ lies on an odd column to the right of j, which means $j(1)-1 \notin D(w)$ Hence, $w_{j(1)-1,i(j(1)-1)} = -1$, which implies that we have a $(-1,1)_{j(1)-1}^j$ pair. Since there is at most one such pair by Lemma 8.14, we must have $t = j(1)-1$. So, $i(t+1) = i(j(1)) = 1$.

The last claim to show is that if we do have a unique $(-1,1)_t^j$ pair, then $B_{1,i(t)-1} \in \text{OddPlusBlock}^j(w)$. By Lemma 8.14 that there must be some p and s with $B_{1,p} \in \text{OddPlusBlock}^j(w)$, $B_{1,s} \in \text{EvenBlock}^j(w)$, with $p < s$. So, $p+1 \in B_{1,s}$ and so $w_{p+1,j(p+1)} = -1$. Since $p+1 \not\equiv n$ and all the rows above $p+1$ have 1's, w has a $(-1,1)_{j(p+1)}^j$ pair. So, since w has only a single $(-1,1)_t^j$ pair, we must have $t = j(p+1)$, as claimed. □

8.2.6. *Property 5.*

Lemma 8.18. *Let $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$ with $\text{Swap}_m^j(w) = \emptyset$. If there is $t \in [n-1]_0$ so that w has a $(-1,-1)_t^j$ pair, then either $i(t+1)+1 = i(t)$ or $B_{i(t+1)+1,i(t)-1} \in \text{EvenPlusBlock}^j(w)$.*

Proof. First, we will show that there is some $B_{r,s} \in \text{Block}^j(w)$ with $i(t)$ and $i(t+1) \in B_{r,s}$, and second we will show $B_{i(t+1)+1,i(t)-1} \in \text{EvenPlusBlock}^j(w)$. The proofs of both of these facts involve an infinite descent.

Suppose there is no r and s so that $B_{r,s} \in \text{EvenBlock}^j(w)$ with $i(t)$ and $i(t+1) \in B_{r,s}$. Let r and s be so that $B_{r,s} \in \text{EvenBlock}^j(w)$ with $t \in B_{r,s}$. By Lemma 8.13, $|\text{minus}_{B_{r,s}} \cap s_e^j(w)| = |\text{minus}_{B_{r,s}} \cap s_o^j(w)|$. Using this, since $i(t+1) \notin B_{r,s}$, there must be some t_2 so that w has a $(-1,-1)_{t_2}^j$ pair with $i(t_2+1) \in B_{r,s}$ but $i(t_2) \notin B_{r,s}$. This implies there is $B_{r_2,s_2} \in \text{Block}^j(w)$ with $s_2 > s$. However, replacing t by t_2 and $B_{r,s}$ by B_{r_2,s_2}, we are in the same situation as we started in, but with $s_2 < s$. So, repeating this process, we obtain that $\text{Block}^j(w)$ has unbounded size. Of course, this is a contradiction, as the matrix is of finite size.

So, we only have to show $B_{i(t+1)+1,i(t)-1} \in \text{EvenPlusBlock}^j(w)$. Suppose w has a $(-1,-1)_t^j$ pair. By the preceding paragraph, we have some $B_{r,s} \in \text{EvenBlock}^j(w)$ with $t, t+1 \in B_{r,s}$. Let k_1 be the maximum row index so that $k_1 > i(t)$ and $w_{k_1,j(k_1)} = -1$. Let $s_1 = j(k_1)$, which exists by the assumptions of the lemma. Note $s_1 \not\equiv t$, since either $i(s_1) = i(t)+1$ or $B_{i(s_1)+1,i(t)-1} \in \text{EvenPlusBlock}^j(w)$. Further, note that $s_1 \neq t+1$, by assumption. Since $s_1 \equiv n$, we have $s_1 - 1 \notin D(w)$, and w has a $(-1,-1)_{s_1-1}^j$ pair. By construction $i(s_1-1) < i(t)$ because $i(s_1-1) < i(s_1)$ and $i(s_1-1) \neq i(t)$. Hence, we are in the same situation we started in, but with $(t, t+1)$ replaced by (s_1-1, s_1) and $i(s_1-1) < i(t)$. So, we have an infinite descent, and, as the matrix has finite size, we obtain a contradiction. □

8.2.7. *Property 6.*

Lemma 8.19. *Let $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$ with $\mathrm{Swap}_m^j(w) = \emptyset$. If $B_{r,s} \in \mathrm{Block}^j(w)$ with $r \neq 1$, then there does not exist $B_{p,q} \in \mathrm{EvenMinusBlock}^j(w)$ with $B_{p,q} \subset B_{r,s}$, $B_{p,q} \neq B_{r,s}$ and $p \equiv r$.*

Proof. Suppose $r > 1$ and there is such an $B_{p,q} \in \mathrm{EvenMinusBlock}^j(w)$, with $p \equiv r$. Then, all $B_{l,m} \in \mathrm{PlusBlock}^j(w)$ with $B_{l,m} \subset B_{r,s}$ satisfy $B_{l,m} \in \mathrm{EvenPlusBlock}^j(w)$, by Lemma 8.9 and all $B_{p,q} \in \mathrm{MinusBlock}^j(w)$ with $p \neq r, q \neq s$ satisfy $B_{p,q} \in \mathrm{EvenMinusBlock}^j(w)$ by Lemma 8.18. These facts, together with the fact that $p \equiv r$ imply that all $B_{p,q} \in \mathrm{MinusBlock}^j(w)$ and $B_{p,q} \subset B_{r,s}$ must satisfy $B_{p,q} \in \mathrm{EvenMinusBlock}^j(w)$. Now, fix p, q such that $B_{p,q} \in \mathrm{MinusBlock}^j(w)$ with $B_{p,q} \subset B_{r,s}$ so that for any other $B_{l,m} \in \mathrm{MinusBlock}^j(w)$ with $B_{l,m} \subset B_{r,s}$ we have $p > l$. There are now two cases depending on whether $p \equiv n$.

Case 1: $p \equiv n$

Since $B_{p,q} \neq B_{r,s}$, either $p-1 \in B_{r,s}$, or $B_{q+1,s} \in \mathrm{EvenPlusBlock}^j(w)$. However, we know that $p-1 \not\equiv n$ and $s \not\equiv n$. If $w_{p-1,j(p-1)} = 1$, since $w_{p,j(p)} = -1$, we have a contradiction to Lemma 8.15. If instead $w_{s,j(s)} = 1$, then $j(s+1)$ is to the left of j, which again contradicts Lemma 8.15. Hence, this situation is impossible.

Case 2: $p \not\equiv n$

In this case, note that $q \equiv n$. Hence $j(q)-1 \not\equiv n$ and $i(j(q)-1) > q$. But this means that $i(j(q)-1) \notin B_{r,s}$, as $B_{p,q}$ the lowest j-block of minus ones in w, contained in $B_{r,s}$. Therefore, there is a $(-1,-1)^j_{j(q)-1}$ pair, which is not contained in any element of $\mathrm{EvenBlock}^j(w)$, contradicting Lemma 8.18. □

Corollary 8.20. *Let $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$ with $\mathrm{Swap}_m^j(w) = \emptyset$. Let $B_{r,s} \in \mathrm{Block}^j(w)$ with $r \neq 1$ and $B_{p,q} \in B^j(w)$. If $B_{p,q} \subset B_{r,s}$, $B_{p,q} \neq B_{r,s}$, then $B_{p,q} \in \mathrm{OddMinusBlock}^j(w)$ if and only if $p = r$ or $q = s$.*

Proof. By Lemma 8.19, if $p = r$ or $q = s$, we must have that $B_{p,q} \in \mathrm{OddMinusBlock}^j(w)$. However, by Lemma 8.10, if $p \neq q$ and $r \neq s$, then $B_{p,q} \in \mathrm{EvenMinusBlock}^j(w)$. □

8.2.8. *Property 7.*

Lemma 8.21. *Let $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$ with $\mathrm{Swap}_m^j(w) = \emptyset$. Let $r \neq 1$, let $B_{r,s} \in \mathrm{EvenBlock}^j(w)$, and let $B_{r,q} \in \mathrm{PlusBlock}^j(w)$ (respectively $B_{p,s} \in \mathrm{PlusBlock}^j(w)$), then $q = s$ (respectively $p = r$.)*

Proof. Suppose there exists $B_{r,q} \subset B_{r,s}$ with $B_{r,q} \in \mathrm{EvenPlusBlock}^j(w)$, with $q \neq s$. Then, there is some $t \in [n-1]$ so that $B_{q+1,t} \in \mathrm{EvenMinusBlock}^j(w)$, with $q+1 \equiv r$, contradicting Lemma 8.19.

An analogous argument goes through in the case of $B_{p,s} \in \mathrm{EvenPlusBlock}^j(w)$: We then have some $t \in [n-1]$ with $t \equiv r$ so that for which $B_{t,s-1} \in \mathrm{MinusBlock}^j(w)$, contradicting Lemma 8.19. □

8.2.9. *Equivalence of the Seven Properties and an empty set of General-Minus j-Swaps.*

Theorem 8.22. *An element $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$ is j-initially uncanceled if and only if $\mathrm{Swap}_m^j(w) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. First, let us check that if $\mathrm{Swap}_m^j(w) = \emptyset$, then it is j-initially uncanceled. The first property holds by Lemma 8.7. Property 2 holds by Lemma 6.4. Property 3 holds by Lemma 8.9. Property 4 is satisfied by Lemma 8.17 and Lemma 8.16. Property 5 is proven in Lemma 8.18. By Lemma 8.20, property 6 holds. Finally, by Lemma 8.21, property 7 holds.

The converse also follows in a straightforward fashion. Lemma 6.5 shows that if $\mathrm{OddBlock}^j(w) = \emptyset$, then $\mathrm{Swap}_l^j(w) = \emptyset$. So, we only need to show $\mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{dp}}^j(w) = \emptyset, \mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{dm}}^j(w) = \emptyset$, and $\mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{sm}}^j(w) = \emptyset$. If $\mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{dp}}^j(w) \cup \mathrm{Swap}_{\mathrm{dm}}^j(w) \neq \emptyset$, then there must be some $B_{r,s} \in \mathrm{Block}^j(w)$ with either $B_{p,q} \in \mathrm{OddPlusBlock}^j(w)$ or $B_{p,q} \in \mathrm{OddMinusBlock}^j(w)$

with $p \neq r, q \neq s$. However, by property 3, the former cannot happen, and, by property 6, the latter cannot happen.

Finally, we check $\mathrm{Swap}^j_{\mathrm{sm}}(w) = \emptyset$. Suppose, suppose $(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^j_{\mathrm{sm}}(w)$ with $t \in B_{r,s}$. If $k \in B_{r,s}$ with $w_{k,j(k)} = -1$, then by properties 6 and 7, we must have both $w_{r,j(r)} = -1$ and $w_{s,j(s)} = -1$. Therefore, we cannot have $(b,t) \in \mathrm{Swap}^j_{\mathrm{sm}}$ with $i(t) \in B_{r,s}$, as this would imply either $w_{r,j(r)} = 1$ or $w_{s,j(s)} = 1$. □

Corollary 8.23. *Recall $U_n^{I^c}$ is the set of j-initially uncanceled elements. It follows that*

$$\sum_{w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)} = \sum_{w \in (U_n^{I^c})_j} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)}.$$

Proof. To prove this, we only need to show there is an involution $i : (C_n^{I^c})_j \setminus (U_n^{I^c})_j \to (C_n^{I^c})_j \setminus (U_n^{I^c})_j$, which is sign reversing and L preserving. However, we have shown in Theorem 8.22 that $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j \setminus (U_n^{I^c})_j$ if and only if $\mathrm{Swap}^j_m(w) \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, using Lemma 8.8, the involution $\mathrm{minSwap}^j_m$ defined in Lemma 5.12 restricts to a sign reversing, L preserving involution on $(C_n^{I^c})_j \setminus (U_n^{I^c})_j$. □

8.3. **Finally Uncanceled Elements.**

Definition 8.24. Let $I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_l\}$. Fix $k \in I \cup \{n\}$ such that $k \equiv i$ for all $i \in I \cup \{n\}$ with $i > k$. An element $w \in C_n^{I^c}$, is *k-finally uncanceled* if w satisfies the following properties.

(1) Either $j(n)$ is left of k or $w_{n,j(n)} = 1$.
(2) $\mathrm{OddBlock}^k(w) = \emptyset$.
(3) Suppose t is a row index so that $w_{t,j(t)} = -1, t$ lies to the right of k, and there is no $s \in [n]$ with $s \geq t$ for which $B_{1,s} \in \mathrm{OddMinusBlock}^k(w)$. Then, there exists $B_{r,s} \in \mathrm{EvenMinusBlock}^k(w)$ with $r \leq t \leq s$.
(4) If n is even, there can be at most one $t \in [n-1]$ for which w has a $(-1,1)^k_t$ pair, and if w has such a pair, then $i(t) = 1$, and $B_{1,i(t+1)-1} \in \mathrm{MinusBlock}^k(w)$. If n is odd, there is no t for which w has a $(-1,1)^k_t$ pair.
(5) If t is so that w has a $(1,1)^k_t$ pair, then either $i(t)+1 = i(t+1)$ or $B_{i(t)+1,i(t+1)-1} \in \mathrm{MinusBlock}^k(w)$.
(6) If $B_{p,q} \in \mathrm{PlusBlock}^k(w)$ and $B_{r,s} \in \mathrm{Block}^k(w)$ with $r > 1, B_{p,q} \subset B_{r,s}$, and $B_{p,q} \neq B_{r,s}$, then $B_{p,q} \in \mathrm{OddMinusBlock}^j(w)$ is an odd block of ones if and only if $p = r$ or $q = s$.
(7) If $r > 1$ and s are row indices with $B_{r,s} \in \mathrm{Block}^k(w)$, and q is a row index with $B_{r,q} \in \mathrm{MinusBlock}^k(w)$ (respectively $B_{p,s} \in \mathrm{MinusBlock}^k(w)$), then $q = s$ (respectively $p = r$.)

Notate $(V_n^{I^c})^k = \{w \in C_n^{I^c} \mid w \text{ is } k\text{-finally uncanceled }\}$.

Remark 8.25. It is important to note that if $w \in (U_n^{I^c})_j$, then $w(j) = n$. However, for $w \in (V_n^{I^c})^k$, we make no such restriction. The reason we were able to further assume that $w(j) = n$ when proving Theorem 8.22 is that the maximal element of $\mathrm{Swap}^j_m(C_n^{I^c})$, preserves column j. However, it will not always be the case that the maximal element of $\mathrm{Swap}^k_p(C_n^{I^c})$, preserves column k. That is, we have no analog of Lemma 8.8. Hence, in Theorem 8.22 we obtained that $(U_n^{I^c})_j$ is precisely the set of $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$ with $\mathrm{Swap}^j_m(w) = \emptyset$, and $j(n) = 1$. In the next Theorem 8.26 we obtain a "weaker" statement that $(V_n^{I^c})^k$ is the set of $w \in (C_n^{I^c})$ so that $\mathrm{Swap}^k_p(w) = \emptyset$.

Theorem 8.26. *Let I and k be as in Definition 8.24. We have the equality*

$$\sum_{w \in C_n^{I^c}} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)} = \sum_{w \in (V_n^{I^c})^k} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)}.$$

Proof. The proof of this result is essentially the same as that of Corollary 8.23, but with the role of $-1's$ and $+1's$ reversed. One key difference is that here we are using

the set $\mathrm{Swap}_p^k(C_n^{I^c})$, whereas in Corollary 8.23 we used $\mathrm{Swap}_m^j(C_n^{I^c})$. See Remark 8.25 for a further discussion of the differences. The analogs of Lemma 8.7, Lemma 6.4, Lemma 8.9, Lemma 8.17, Lemma 8.16, Lemma 8.18, Lemma 8.20, Lemma 8.21 all easily go through similarly with $1's$ and $-1's$ interchanged. Then, the analog of Theorem 8.22 tells us $\mathrm{Swap}_p^k(w) = \emptyset$, if and only if w is k-finally uncanceled. Finally, we can use the involutionminSwap$_p^k$ to cancel off all elements of $C_n^{I^c} \setminus (V_n^{I^c})^k$.

□

8.4. **The Lowering Map.**

Notation 8.27. Fix $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}, j, i_{r+1} \dots, i_l\} \subset [n-1]_0, n \in I$ with $j = i_r$ and $\delta_k \equiv 0$ for $k \geq r$, as was stipulated in Notation 8.1. Then, denote

$$J = I^{(r)} = \{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}, j-1, i_{r+1} - 1, \dots, i_l - 1\} \subset [n-2]_0.$$

Unless otherwise stipulated **for the rest of this section**, retain this notation for I and J. Now, in order to complete the proof of Theorem 4.3, all that remains is to show there is a bijection between elements of $(U_n^{I^c})_j$ and $(V_{n-1}^{J^c})^{j-1}$, which decreases L by $n-j$ and preserves the sign of w. We define this map in Algorithm 8.5, and then prove it satisfies the desired properties.

Algorithm 8.5. The *lowering map* $H : (U_n^{I^c})_j \to B_{n-1}$, taking a j-initially uncanceled element $w \in (U_n^{I^c})_j$, to an element $H(w)$, where $H(w)$ is computed by the following algorithm:

Step 1

Let $w_1 = ws_j \cdots s_{n-2}s_{n-1}$. Since $(w_1)_{n,n} = 1$, consider w_1 as in B_{n-1}, which is naturally embedded in B_n as the set of all elements fixing n.

Step 2

For $1 \leq r < t \leq n$, define the function $p_{r,t} : B_{n-1} \to B_{n-1}, x \mapsto s_r s_{r+1} \cdots s_t x$. Let $\mathrm{EvenPlusBlock}^{j-1}(w_1) = \{B_{r_1,s_1}, \dots, B_{r_p,s_p}\}$. Let $w_2 = p_{r_1,t_1} \circ \cdots \circ p_{r_p,s_p}(w_1)$.

Step 3

If $B_{1,1} \in \mathrm{OddMinusBlock}^{j-1}(w_2)$, let $w_3 = s_0 w_2$, otherwise, let $w_3 = w_2$.

Step 4

For $1 \leq r < t \leq n$, define the function $n_{r,t} : B_{n-1} \to B_{n-1}, x \mapsto s_{t-1} \cdots s_{r-1} x$. Let $\mathrm{MinusBlock}^{j-1}(w_3) = \{B_{r_1,s_1}, \dots, B_{r_p,s_p}\}$. Let $H(w) = n_{r_p,t_p} \circ \cdots \circ n_{r_1,s_1}(w_3)$.

Remark 8.28. Note that in steps 2 and 4 that w_2 and $H(w)$ are independent of the order in which we apply $p_{r,t}, n_{r,t}$ since nonadjacent transpositions commute. Additionally, observe that Step 3 is either $w_3 = w_2$ or $w_3 = n_{1,1}w_2$, but we separate this from Step 4 as in Lemma 8.32 and Lemma 8.33, it will be easier to analyze these separately.

Remark 8.29. An alternative characterization of the Algorithm 8.5 is as follows. First cross out column j and row n, to get a matrix in B_{n-1}. Then, start at the bottom of the matrix, and move upward. Whenever there is a 1 in row t to the right of j, switch rows $t, t+1$. Once we hit the top of the matrix, we then proceed downward, and whenever row t has a "-1" to the right of j, interchange rows t and $t-1$, unless $t = 0$, in which case we change the sign of row 1.

We tend to use this point of view of interchanging two adjacent rows in the ensuing proofs, although of course it is equivalent to applying transpositions to the matrix.

Example 8.30. Let us now give an example of how the algorithm would proceed. Let

$$w = \begin{pmatrix} & & & & & & & 1 \\ & & & & & & -1 & \\ & 1 & & & & & & \\ & & 1 & & & & & \\ & & & & -1 & & & \\ & & & & & & & 1 \\ & & & & & & & & 1 \\ & & & -1 & & & & \\ & & 1 & & & & & \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here, since $w(3) = 9$, we set $j = 3$. In step 1, we move $j(9) = 3$ to the far right, resulting in

$$\begin{pmatrix} & & & & & & & 1 \leftarrow \bullet \\ & & & & & & -1 \leftarrow \bullet & \\ & 1 & & & & & & \\ & & 1 & & & & & \\ & & & & -1 \leftarrow \bullet & & & \\ & & & & & & & 1 \leftarrow \bullet \\ & & & & & & & & 1 \leftarrow \bullet \\ & & & -1 \leftarrow \bullet & & & & \\ & & \bullet & \longrightarrow & & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now, viewing this as an element of B_8, we have

$$w_1 = \begin{pmatrix} & & & & & & & 1 \\ & & & & & & -1 & \\ & 1 & & & & & & \\ & & 1 & & & & & \\ & & & & -1 & & & \\ & & & & & & & 1 \\ & & & & & & & & 1 \\ & & & -1 & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \end{pmatrix}.$$

Next, we perform step 2, which moves the $(1,1)^2_7$ pair down by 1, and pushes the -1 in column 3 up by 2.

$$\begin{pmatrix} & & & 1 & & & \\ & & -1 & & & & \\ 1 & & & & & & \\ & 1 & & & & & \\ & & & -1 & & & \\ & & -1 & & & \bullet & \\ & & \uparrow & & & \downarrow & \\ & & | & & & 1 & \bullet \\ & & \bullet & & & & \downarrow \\ & & & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

However, we have not completed step 2, because there is another 2-block of ones in w_1, namely $B_{1,1} \in \text{PlusBlock}^2(w)$ and so we transpose the top two rows. The resulting matrix is

$$w_2 = \begin{pmatrix} & & & -1 & \bullet & & \\ & & & \uparrow & \downarrow & & \\ & & & \bullet & 1 & & \\ 1 & & & & & & \\ & 1 & & & & & \\ & & & -1 & & & \\ & & -1 & & & & \\ & & & & & 1 & \\ & & & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Next, we apply step 3. Since $B_{1,1} \in \text{OddMinusBlock}^2(w)$, we change the sign of the top row. This results in the matrix

$$w_3 = \begin{pmatrix} & & & \textcircled{1} & & & \\ & & & & 1 & & \\ 1 & & & & & & \\ & 1 & & & & & \\ & & & -1 & & & \\ & & -1 & & & & \\ & & & & & 1 & \\ & & & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Finally, we perform step 4, moving the -1's in rows 5 and 6 up by one row, and moving the 1 in the 4th row down two rows. We obtain

$$H(w) = \begin{pmatrix} & & & 1 & & & \\ & & & & 1 & & \\ 1 & & & & & & \\ & \bullet & & -1 & & & \\ & \downarrow & & \uparrow & & & \\ & & -1 & \bullet & & & \\ & & \uparrow & & & & \\ & 1 & \bullet & & & & \\ & & & & & 1 & \\ & & & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This is our final result. Lo and behold, $H(w)$ is a chessboard element with a very similar descent set to our original matrix, and furthermore, it is actually a $j-1$-finally uncanceled matrix. We can also see by direct computation that $\operatorname{sgn}(w) = \operatorname{sgn}(H(w)) = -1$, and $L(w) = 15, L(H(w)) = 9$. Since $n = 9, j = 3$, we have that $L(w) - L(H(w)) = 15 - 9 = 6 = n - j$.

In fact, this is no coincidence, and this lowering map defines a bijection between the j-initially uncanceled elements of $(C_n^{I^c})_j$ and the $j-1$-finally uncanceled elements of $C_{n-1}^{I^c}$, in a way that preserves $\operatorname{sgn}(w)$ and changes $L(w)$ by $n-j$.

Lemma 8.31. *Let $w \in (U_n^{I^c})_j$. Then, the matrix w_3, after step 3 of Algorithm 8.5, has* $\text{OddMinusBlock}^{j-1}(w_3) = \emptyset$. *Furthermore, all $(-1,-1)_t^j$ pairs in w_3 satisfy $i(t+1) = i(t)-1$. That is, they lie in adjacent rows.*

Proof. If some $B_{p,q} \in \text{Block}^{j-1}(w) \setminus (\text{EvenMinusBlock}^{j-1}(w) \cup \text{EvenPlusBlock}^{j-1}(w))$, and if $p > 1$, we know by property 6 and property 7 of j-initially uncanceled matrices, that the pattern of $+1$'s and -1's contained in $B_{p,q}$, is as follows: At the top, there is a $j-1$-odd block of minus ones in w. Beneath it, there are alternating even $j-1$-blocks of plus ones in w and even $j-1$-blocks of minus ones in w, until finally there is an odd $j-1$-block of minus ones in w. Hence, moving all the even $j-1$-blocks of plus ones in w_1 down by a row in step 2 forces the top row of each $j-1$-block of minus ones in w_3 to move to a higher $j-1$-block of minus ones in w_3. This, together with possibly changing the sign of the top row, as is done in step 3, ensures that all the resulting $j-1$-blocks of minus ones in w_3 will lie in $\text{EvenMinusBlock}^{j-1}(w_3)$. For an example, see the movement between w_1 and w_3 in Example 8.30.

The fact that $i_{w_3}(t+1) = i_{w_3}(t) - 1$, follows directly from property 5. That is, since we move the 1's between each $(-1,-1)_{t+1}^j$ pair in w down, the $(-1,-1)_{t+1}^j$ pair in w becomes a $(-1,-1)_t^{j-1}$ pair in w_3, which is moved together in step 2 so that $i_{w_3}(t+1) = i_{w_3}(t) - 1$. □

Lemma 8.32. *The image $H(U_n^{I^c})_j$ is contained in $C_{n-1}^{J^c}$.*

Proof. We must show that for any $w \in (U_n^{I^c})_j$, we have $D(H(w)) \subset J$, and that the final result is a chessboard element. Fix some $w \in (U_n^{I^c})_j$, and let w_i denote the result after Step i of algorithm Algorithm 8.5 is applied to w. First, it is clear that $D(w_1) \subset J$, because $D(w) \subset I$, and in step 1 we have $t \in D(w_1)$ and $t > j$ if and only if $t+1 \in D(w)$. In steps 2,3,4, the descent set also remains unchanged: Any row to the left of j maintains the same relative position to any other row to the left of j, which shows that the descent set is preserved to the left of j. For rows to the right of j, we are only moving rows which contain $+1$'s up, and rows which contain -1's down, and we are always preserving the relative order of the rows with -1's and preserving the relative order of the rows with $+1$'s. So, the final descent set is contained J and the image of H is contained in $B_{n-1}^{J^c}$.

Next, we check that the image only contains chessboard elements. After step 1, all the column indices t which are column left of j are on squares with $t \equiv i_{w_1}(t)$. For this argument, we will call squares $(i(t), t)$ with $t \equiv i(t)$ chessboard squares. After step 1, all the ± 1's which are column right of column j are not on chessboard squares.

In step 2, we analyze the effect of $p_{r,s}$ on w_1 in two cases, depending on whether $\text{OddPlusBlock}^{j-1}(w_1) = \emptyset$.

First, the case that $\text{OddPlusBlock}^{j-1}(w_1) = \emptyset$. Then, for each $B_{r,s} \in \text{EvenPlusBlock}^{j-1}(w_1)$, we have that $p_{r,s}$ moves each $+1$ to the right of j down by a single row, so that it will then be on a chessboard square, but since $B_{r,s} \in \text{EvenPlusBlock}^{j-1}(w_1)$, for all $k \notin B_{r,s}, (k, j(k))$, we have that k is chessboard before applying $p_{r,s}$ if and only if it is chessboard after applying $p_{r,s}$.

Second, the case that $\text{OddPlusBlock}^{j-1}(w_1) \neq \emptyset$, so that $\{B_{1,s}\} = \text{OddPlusBlock}^{j-1}(w_1)$ by property 3 of Definition 8.5. By applying $p_{1,s}$, the -1 the row $s+1$ is moved up an odd number of rows, and hence for all $m, 1 \leq m \leq s+1$, we have $i_{w_2}(m) \not\equiv i_{w_1}(m)$.

In step 3, we see for all $k \in [n]$ that $i_{w_2}(k) = i_{w_3}(k)$.

Finally, in step 4, if there is some k with $B_{1,k} \in \text{EvenMinusBlock}^{j-1}(w_3)$, then the -1 in the top row is changed to a 1 and moved down to the even row $k+1$. The other rows m with $2 \leq m \leq s$ satisfy $i_{H(w)}(m) = i_{w_3}(m) + 1$. Otherwise, if $B_{p,q} \in \text{MinusBlock}^{j-1}(w_3)$, then the parity of all rows m with $p \leq m \leq q$ satisfy $i_{H(w)}(m) = i_{w_3}(m) + 1$. Finally, thanks to Lemma 8.31, $\text{OddMinusBlock}^{j-1}(w_3) = \emptyset$, and so for m not in any $B_{p,q} \subset \text{OddBlock}^{j-1}(w_3)$, we have $i_{H(w)}(m) \equiv i_{w_3}(m)$.

Hence, from steps 2, 3, and 4, we have changed the parity of the rows to the right of j and preserved the parity of the rows with row indices $\leq j$, resulting in a chessboard element. □

Lemma 8.33. *The image $H((U_n^{I^c})_j)$ is contained in $(V_{n-1}^{J^c})^{j-1}$.*

Proof. Let $w \in U_n^{I^c})_j$ and let w_i be the result of Algorithm 8.5 after step i. We check that $H(w)$ satisfies the seven properties of $j-1$-finally uncanceled matrices.

Property 1

First, we show $H(w)$ satisfies Property 1. If w_3 does not satisfy property 1, then in Step 4, the -1 in row $n-1$ is moved up by a row, and so either $j(n-1) \leq j-1$ or $H(w)_{n-1,j(n-1)} = 1$.

Property 2

Next, $H(w)$ satisfies property 2 because the parities of the columns to the left of j are preserved by Algorithm 8.5 as shown in Lemma 8.32. Since the relative positions of the rows to the left of j are also preserved under Algorithm 8.5, it follows that the parities of the blocks in $H(w)$ are the same as the parities of the blocks in (w).

Property 3

Property 3 holds by Lemma 8.31, since step 4 of the algorithm does not separate any j-blocks of minus ones in w.

Property 4

In order to show property 4 of $j-1$-finally uncanceled matrices holds after the algorithm, we break up the argument into five cases depending on what the topmost j-block in w, $B_{r,s} \in \text{Block}^j(w)$ is. That is, we can check it in the cases that $r > 1$, there is some q with $B_{1,q} \in \text{OddMinusBlock}^j(w)$, $B_{1,q} \in \text{OddPlusBlock}^j(w)$, $B_{1,q} \in \text{EvenMinusBlock}^j(w)$, and finally $B_{1,q} \in \text{EvenPlusBlock}^j(w)$. Below, we'll only write out the details for the case that there is some q with $B_{1,q} \in \text{EvenMinusBlock}^j(w)$. The other cases are similar.

Suppose there is some q with $B_{1,q} \in \text{EvenMinusBlock}^j(w)$. Since row 1 does not lie in an odd j-block of minus ones in w, there are no $(-1,1)_t^j$ pairs. So, w has a $(-1,-1)_{j_w(1)-1}^j$ pair, meaning $1 \equiv n$. Then, we see $B_{1,q-1} \in \text{OddBlock}^{j-1}(H(w))$ and $H(w)$ has a $(-1,1)_{j_{H(w)}(1)}^{j-1}$

pair. Additionally, $i_{H(w)}(j_{H(w)}(1)) = 1$, (as is always true,) and $i_{H(w)}(j_{H(w)}(1)+1) = q+1$, satisfying property 4 of $j-1$-finally uncanceled matrices.

Property 5

Property 5 holds because if we start with $w \in B_n^{I^c}$ which has a $(1,1)_t^j$ pair, then by Lemma 8.15 we initially have $i_w(t+1) = i_w(t)+1$. Therefore, these 1's will remain adjacent through step 3, that is $i_{w_3}(t) = i_{w_3}(t-1)+1$. Therefore, in step 4, they will either remain adjacent, or be separated by a single $j-1$-even block of minus ones in $H(w)$.

Properties 6 and 7

Note, that it is easy to check these conditions are satisfied when we are dealing with $B_{r,s} \in \text{Block}^j(w)$ with $r = 1$ and so for the remainder of this verification, we assume $r > 1$.

Observe next that properties 6 and 7 of $j-1$-finally uncanceled matrices are equivalent to the following: For $B_{r,s} \in \text{Block}^{j-1}(H(w))$, which contains both ones and minus ones,

$$B_{r,s} = B_{r,s_1} \cup B_{s_1+1,s_2} \cup B_{s_2+1,s_3} \cdots \cup B_{s_{k-2}+1,s_{k-1}} \cup B_{s_{k-1}+1,s}, \tag{8.1}$$

where $B_{r,s_1}, B_{s_{k-1}+1,s} \in \text{OddPlusBlock}^{j-1}(H(w))$, but $B_{s_2+1,s_3}, B_{s_4+1,s_5}, \ldots, B_{s_{k-3}+1,s_{k-2}} \in \text{EvenPlusBlock}^{j-1}(H(w))$ and $B_{s_1+1,s_2}, B_{s_3+1,s_4}, \ldots, B_{s_{k-2}+1,s_{k-1}} \in \text{EvenMinusBlock}^{j-1}(w)$.

By properties 2, 3, and 5, to complete the proof, we only have to eliminate the possibility that $B_{r,s}$ written as in Equation (8.1) with $B_{r,s_1} \in \text{EvenPlusBlock}^{j-1}(H(w))$. Suppose there is some $w \in (U_n^{I^c})_j$ so that this is the case. Then, working backwards, we see $B_{r,s_1-1} \in \text{OddPlusBlock}^{j-1}(w_3)$. There are now two cases: First, if $r+2 = s_1$, we see there are some $t,k,l \in [n]$ with $B_{r,t} \in \text{Block}^j(w)$ with $B_{r,k} \in \text{EvenMinusBlock}^j(w), B_{k,l} \in \text{EvenPlusBlock}^j(w)$. But this means w does not satisfy property 6 of j-initially uncanceled matrices. Second, if $s_1 - r > 2$, we obtain that there are some t,k,l so that $B_{r,t} \in \text{Block}^j(w), B_{r,s_1-2} \in \text{EvenPlusBlock}^j(w), B_{s_1-2,s_2-2} \in \text{EvenMinusBlock}^j(w)$, implying that w does not satisfy property 7 of j-initially uncanceled matrices. □

8.6. **The Lowering Map's Effect on L.** In this subsection, we check that H preserves $\text{sgn}(w)$ and changes $L(w)$ by $n-j$.

Lemma 8.34. *Let $w \in (U_n^{I^c})_j$. Then, $\text{sgn}(w) = \text{sgn}(H(w))$.*

Proof. In all four steps, we multiply w by a certain number of Coxeter generators. It suffices to check that the we multiply w by an even number of Coxeter generators to obtain $H(w)$. In step 1, there are $n-j \equiv 0$ Coxeter generators by which w is multiplied to obtain w_1. In steps 2, 3, 4, w is also multiplied by $n-j$ Coxeter generators. Hence, w is multiplied by a total of $2(n-j)$ Coxeter generators to obtain $H(w)$, and hence $\text{sgn}(w) = \text{sgn}(H(w))$. □

Lemma 8.35. *Let $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$, and $y = s_{n-1}s_{n-2}\cdots s_j w$. Note that $y(n) = n$. Then, $L(y) = L(w) - |u_o^j(w)s_e^j(w)| - |u_e^j(w)s_o^j(w)| + |u_e^j(w)s_e^j(w)| + |u_o^j(w)s_o^j(w)| - \frac{n-j}{2}$.*

Proof. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} a(y) - a(w) &= -|s_o^j(w)| + |s_e^j(w)|, \\ b(y) - b(w) &= -\frac{n-j}{2}, \\ c(y) - c(w) &= -|u_o^j(w)s_e^j(w)| + |u_o^j(w)s_o^j(w)|. \end{aligned}$$

Then, using the abc Lemma 2.12, $L(w) = a(w) + b(w) + 2c(w)$, so

$$\begin{aligned} L(y) - L(w) &= a(y) + b(y) + 2c(y) - a(w) - b(w) - 2c(w) \\ &= a(y) - a(w) + b(y) - b(w) + 2(c(y) - c(w)) \\ &= -|s_o^j(w)| + |s_e^j(w)| - \frac{n-j}{2} - 2|u_o^j(w)s_e^j(w)| + 2|u_o^j(w)s_o^j(w)| \\ &= -|u_o^j(w)s_e^j(w)| - |u_e^j(w)s_o^j(w)| + |u_e^j(w)s_e^j(w)| + |u_o^j(w)s_o^j(w)| - \frac{n-j}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 8.36. *We have*

$$L\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \pm 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} - L\begin{pmatrix} \pm 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = 1 \tag{8.2}$$

$$L\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ \pm 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} - L\begin{pmatrix} \pm 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} = -1 \tag{8.3}$$

$$L\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} - L\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = 2 \tag{8.4}$$

$$L\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} - L\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = 1, \tag{8.5}$$

where if we choose + for the ± sign on the first matrix, we must also choose + for the ± sign on the second matrix.

Proof. The proof is given by calculating L in the four situations. □

Lemma 8.37. *Let $w \in (U_n^{I^c})_j$. Let rows $t, t+1, t+2$ be three consecutive positive integers with $t \equiv n$, and suppose there is some $q \geq t+2$ with $B_{t+1,q} \in \text{PlusBlock}^j(w)$, (respectively there is some $p \leq t$ with $B_{p,t+1} \in \text{PlusBlock}^j(w)$). If we let $v = s_{t+1}s_t w$ (respectively $v = s_t s_{t+1} w$), then, $L(w) - 1 = L(v)$.*

Proof. Let us prove it for the case there is some $q \geq t+2$ with $B_{t+1,q} \in \text{PlusBlock}^j(w)$ using Lemma 8.15. The other case in which there is $p \leq t$ with $B_{p,t+1} \in \text{PlusBlock}^j(w)$ is analogous, by reversing the role of $1's$ and $-1's$.

Since $t+2 \equiv n$, it follows that $t+1, t+2$ is a $(1,1)^j_{j(t+1)}$ pair, and hence $j(t+1) = j(t)+1$. Define w_t to be the 3×3 sub-matrix whose entries are the intersection of rows $t, t+1, t+2$ and of columns $j(t), j(t+1), j(t+2)$, and let v_t be the analogous 3×3 sub-matrix of v.

First, since rows $t, t+1, t+2$ are adjacent, $L(w) - L(v) = L(w_t) - L(v_t)$. One can prove this using methods analogous to those in the Swapping Lemma, by noting that the values of $b_j(w_t) = b_j(v_t)$ and $c_j(w_t) = c_j(v_t)$, as long as $j \notin \{j(t), j(t+1), j(t+2)\}$.

Now, there are two cases, either $j(t+2) < j(t)$ or $j(t+2) > j(t)$. For simplicity, let us assume $j(t+2) > j(t)$; the other case is analogous. So, by the preceding paragraph, we have $L(v) - L(w) = L(v_t) - L(w_t)$. Now, we may note that $a(v_t) = a(w_t)$ and also that

$$b_{2,3}(w_t) = b_{2,3}(v_t)$$
$$c_{2,3}(w_t) = c_{2,3}(v_t).$$

So, the only difference in $L(v_t)$ and $L(w_t)$ comes from columns $1, 2$, which is precisely calculated by equations (8.2), (8.3) from Lemma 8.36. Thus, $L(v_t) - L(w_t) = -1$, which implies $L(v) - L(w) = -1$. □

Lemma 8.38. *For any $w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j$ with $\text{Swap}_m^j(w) = \emptyset$, we have*

$$|u_o^j(w)s_e^j(w)| - |u_o^j(w)s_o^j(w)| = 0,$$

$$|u_e^j(w)s_e^j(w)| - |u_e^j(w)s_o^j(w)| = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if there is some } t \text{ for which } w \text{ has a } (-1,1)_t^j \text{ pair,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Observe that by Lemma 8.18, $|u_o^j(w)s_o^j(w)| - |u_o^j(w)s_e^j(w)|$ is, up to sign, the number of t for which w has a $(-1,1)_t^j$ pair with $t \in u_o^j(w)$. Similarly, $|u_e^j(w)s_e^j(w)| - |u_e^j(w)s_o^j(w)|$ is, up to sign, the the number of $(-1,1)_t^j$ pairs with $t \in u_e^j(w)$. By Lemma 8.17, Lemma 8.16 the only way we can have a $(-1,1)_t^j$ pair is if n is odd, t is even, and there are no rows s with s to the left of j such that $s < t$. Therefore, if w does have a $(-1,1)_t$ pair, then we must have $t \in u_e^j(w), t \in s_e^j(w)$. Hence, $|u_o^j(w)s_o^j(w)| - |u_o^j(w)s_e^j(w)| = 0$ and $|u_e^j(w)s_e^j(w)| - |u_e^j(w)s_o^j(w)| = 1$ precisely when there is some t for which w has a $(-1,1)_t^j$ pair. □

Lemma 8.39. *Let $w \in (U_n^{I^c})_j$. Then, $L(H(w)) = L(w) - n + j$.*

Proof. By Lemma 8.35, if w_1 the result of w after step 1 of Algorithm 8.5, then $L(w_1) = L(w) - |u_o^j(w)s_e^j(w)| - |u_e^j(w)s_o^j(w)| + |u_e^j(w)s_e^j(w)| + |u_o^j(w)s_o^j(w)| - \frac{n-j}{2}$. So, we only need to show that in steps 2 through 4, we change L by $|u_o^j(w)s_e^j(w)| + |u_e^j(w)s_o^j(w)| - |u_e^j(w)s_e^j(w)| - |u_o^j(w)s_o^j(w)| - \frac{n-j}{2}$.

We now proceed by casework, depending on whether or there is some t so that w has a $(-1,1)_t^j$ pair.

Case 1: There is no $(-1,1)_t^j$ pair

Since there is no $t \in [n-1]$ so that w has a $(-1,1)_t^j$ pair, by Lemma 8.38,

$$|u_o^j(w)s_e^j(w)| + |u_e^j(w)s_o^j(w)| - |u_e^j(w)s_e^j(w)| - |u_o^j(w)s_o^j(w)| = 0. \tag{8.6}$$

Case 1a: $w_{1,j(1)} = 1$. In this case, we will make exactly $\frac{n-j}{2}$ moves of the type as in Lemma 8.37. By Lemma 8.37, each such move decreases L by 1. Hence, we change L by a total of $-\frac{n-j}{2} = |u_o^j(w)s_e^j(w)| + |u_e^j(w)s_o^j(w)| - |u_e^j(w)s_e^j(w)| - |u_o^j(w)s_o^j(w)| - \frac{n-j}{2}$, by Equation (8.6).

Case 1b: $w_{1,j(1)} = -1$.

In this case, we will only have $\frac{n-j}{2} - 1$ moves as in Lemma 8.37. However, during step 2, we will have one move as in Equation (8.5). Since this decreases L by one, steps 2 through 4 change L by a total of

$$\left(-\frac{n-j}{2} + 1\right) - 1 = |u_o^j(w)s_e^j(w)| + |u_e^j(w)s_o^j(w)| - |u_e^j(w)s_e^j(w)| - |u_o^j(w)s_o^j(w)| - \frac{n-j}{2}.$$

Case 2: There is a $(-1,1)_t^j$ pair

In this case, will have $\frac{n-j}{2} - 1$ moves as in Lemma 8.37. But, in step 2, we have a single move as in Equation (8.4). Note that this move decreases L by 2. Therefore, we change L by a total of $-\frac{n-j}{2} + 1 - 2 = -\frac{n-j}{2} - 1$, and indeed, $|u_o^j(w)s_e^j(w)| + |u_e^j(w)s_o^j(w)| - |u_e^j(w)s_e^j(w)| - |u_o^j(w)s_o^j(w)| = -1$. Therefore, in steps 2 through 4, using Lemma 8.38, L changes by

$$-\frac{n-j}{2} - 1 = |u_o^j(w)s_e^j(w)| + |u_e^j(w)s_o^j(w)| - |u_e^j(w)s_e^j(w)| - |u_o^j(w)s_o^j(w)| - \frac{n-j}{2}.$$

□

8.7. **The Inverse to the Lowering Map.** We have shown so far that there is a map $H(U_n^{I^c})_j \to (V_{n-1}^{J^c})^{j-1}$, which alters $L(w)$ by $n-j$, and preserves $\mathrm{sgn}(w)$. In order to complete the proof of Theorem 4.3, we only need to show this is a bijection. In what follows, we produce the inverse map.

Algorithm 8.8. Define the *raising map* $R : (V_{n-1}^{J^c})^{j-1} \to B_n$, which takes a $j-1$-finally uncanceled element $w \in (V_n^{J^c})^{j-1}$, to an element $R(w)$, where $R(w)$ is computed by the following algorithm.

Step 1

For $1 \leq r < t \leq n$, define the functions $rn_{r,t} : B_{n-1} \to B_{n-1}, x \mapsto s_r \cdots s_t x$. Let $\mathrm{EvenMinusBlock}^{j-1}(w) = \{B_{r_1,s_1}, \ldots, B_{r_p,s_p}\}$. Let $w_1 = rn_{r_1,t_1} \circ \cdots \circ n_{r_p,s_p}(w_3)$.

Step 2

If $B_{1,1} \in \mathrm{OddPlusBlock}^{j-1}(w_1)$, let $w_2 = s_0 w_1$.

Step 3

For $1 \leq r < t \leq n$, define the functions $rp_{r,t} : B_{n-1} \to B_{n-1}, x \mapsto s_{t-1} \cdots s_{r-1} x$. Let $\mathrm{PlusBlock}^{j-1}(w_2) = \{B_{r_1,s_1}, \ldots, B_{r_p,s_p}\}$. Let $w_3 = rn_{r_p,t_p} \circ \cdots \circ n_{r_1,s_1}(w_2)$.

Step 4

Let w_4 be the image of w_3 under the natural embedding $B_{n-1} \to B_n$. That is,

$$w_4(i) = \begin{cases} w_3(i), & \text{if } i \neq \pm n, \\ i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Step 5 Define $L(w) = ws_{n-1} \cdots s_{j+1}s_j$.

Lemma 8.40. *The image $R((V_{n-1}^{J^c})^{j-1})$ is contained in $(U_n^{I^c})_j$.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Lemma 8.33. □

Lemma 8.41. *The maps $H : (U_n^{I^c})_j \to (V_{n-1}^{J^c})^{j-1}, R : (V_{n-1}^{J^c})^{j-1} \to (U_n^{I^c})_j$ are mutual inverses.*

Proof. By Lemma 8.33 and Lemma 8.40, H is indeed a map $H : (U_n^{I^c})_j \to (V_{n-1}^{J^c})^{j-1}$ and R is indeed a map $R : (V_{n-1}^{J^c})^{j-1} \to (U_n^{I^c})_j$. Furthermore, the algorithms were precisely constructed so that $H \circ R = \mathrm{id}$ and $R \circ H = \mathrm{id}$, since in H we are multiplying by transpositions s_i, and in R we are multiplying by the same transpositions in the opposite order. Here we are crucially using that $s_i^2 = 1$, as B_n is a Coxeter group. □

8.9. **Completion of Part 3.**

Corollary 8.42. *Part 3 of Theorem 4.3 holds. That is, let $I \subset [n-1]_0$, and $j = i_k \in I \cup \{n\}$. Then $S_{n,I,i_k}(X) = f_{n,J}(X)$, where J is as defined in Notation 8.27.*

Proof. We proceed by induction. Note that Theorem 4.3 trivially holds when $n = 1$, so we will assume it holds for $n-1$ and prove it holds for n.

In Lemma 8.41, we showed that H induces a bijection $H : (U_n^{I^c})_j \to (V_{n-1}^{J^c})^{j-1}$, and by Lemma 8.39, we see $L(H(w)) = L(w) - n + j$ and $\mathrm{sgn}(H(w)) = \mathrm{sgn}(w)$. This tells us

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{w \in (U_n^{I^c})_j} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)} &= \sum_{w \in (U_n^{I^c})_j} (-1)^{l(H(w))} X^{L(H(w))+n-j} \\ &= X^{n-j} \cdot \sum_{w \in (V_{n-1}^{J^c})^{j-1}} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.7}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{n,I,j}(X) &= \sum_{w \in (C_n^{I^c})_j} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)} && (\textit{Notation 4.2}) \\ &= \sum_{w \in (U_n^{I^c})_j} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)} && (\textit{Corollary 8.23}) \\ &= X^{n-j} \cdot \sum_{w \in (V_{n-1}^{J^c})^{j-1}} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)} && (\textit{Equation 8.7}) \\ &= X^{n-j} \cdot \sum_{w \in C_{n-1}^{J^c}} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)} && (\textit{Theorem 8.26}) \\ &= X^{n-j} \cdot f_{n-1,J}(X) && (\text{the inductive hypothesis}). \end{aligned}$$

□

9. A Further Conjecture

In the above sections, we found a nice way to factor $\sum_{w \in B_n^{I^c}} (-1)^{l(w)} X^{L(w)}$. It is natural to ask if there is any nice way to factor the expression $\sum_{w \in B_n^{I^c}} t^{l(w)} X^{L(w)}$, where we replace -1 by a general variable t. It seems that in general, there is not a nice factorization, but in the case that $0 \in I$, there may be a nice single factor.

Conjecture 1. The two variable polynomial $Xt + 1$ divides $\sum_{w \in B_n^{I^c}} t^{l(w)} X^{L(w)}$ if and only if $0 \in I$.

Remark 9.1. This conjecture is true for all subsets $I \subset [n-1]_0$ with $n \leq 6$, as was verified by the computer. However, we do not see a way to generalize the techniques used in this paper to prove Conjecture 1. Note also that when we plug in $t = -1$, we obtain the formula in Theorem 2.5, but $-X+1$ divides $f_{n,I}(X)$ so long as $I \neq \emptyset$, and so Theorem 2.5 does not appear to be very helpful in proving Conjecture 1.

10. Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Vic Reiner for bringing the conjecture to my attention, offering many helpful edits, and for listening to my ideas. Of course, I thank Alexander Stasinski, Christopher Voll, and Rob Little for the many hours they spent scrutinously reading over this proof. I also thank an anonymous referee for helping me clarify and streamline numerous confusing issues and notations. I thank David Hemminger and Zijian Yao for carefully critiquing the most technical parts of the argument. Further thanks goes to my father, Peter Landesman, for his useful edits and his support. Finally, I would like to thank Levent Alpoge for an especially motivating comment regarding starting work before the REU. This research was conducted at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities REU, supported by RTG grant NSF/DMS-1148634 and the Univ. of Minnesota School of Mathematics.

References

[1] A. Björner and F. Brenti. *Combinatorics of Coxeter groups*, volume 231 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, 2005.

[2] F. Brenti and A. Carnevale. Proof of a conjecture of klopsch-voll on weyl groups of type a. `http://www.mat.uniroma2.it/~brenti/odd.pdf`, 2015.

[3] B. Klopsch and C. Voll. Igusa-type functions associated to finite formed spaces and their functional equations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 361:4405–4436, 2009.

[4] A. Stasinski and C. Voll. A new statistic on the hyperoctahedral groups. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 20, no. 3:Paper 50, 2013.

[5] A. Stasinski and C. Voll. Representation zeta functions of nilpotent groups and generating functions for weyl groups of type b. *Amer. J. Math.*, 136:501–550, 2014.

Aaron Landesman, Harvard University
E-mail address: `aaronlandesman@gmail.com`